

Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Collection of Puritan Literature.

Division

RL

Section

Number

SCB
10924

James R. [unclear]

A Brief and Plain

DISCOVERY

OF THE

Falseness and Unscripturalness

OF

ANABAPTISM:

As the same is now Practis'd by those of that Perswasion: Wherein is plainly prov'd, from God's Word, the following Particulars,

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>I. That God's Covenant with <i>Abraham</i>, <i>Gen.</i> 17.7. is the Covenant of Grace, whereby all God's Elect are Saved.</p> <p>II. That Circumcision was the Initiatory Seal of that Covenant to <i>Abraham</i> and his Church-Seed, during that Dispensation.</p> <p>III. That Water-Baptism is now (under the Gospel) succeeded in the room thereof.</p> | <p>IV. That the <i>Gentile</i> Believers and their Infant-Seed, have as real a Right to the same Covenant of Grace, and the Seal thereof, as had <i>Abraham</i> and his Infant Seed.</p> <p>V. That sprinkling (or pouring out) Water, on the Subject of Baptism, is the (undoubted) Right way of Administering Baptism under the Gospel.</p> |
|--|---|

To which are added,

Some Remarks on a Nameless Author; and a Post-script, occasion'd by Mr. *Stennet's* Reply to *Russen*.

By *James Barry*. [The Third Edition.]

L O N D O N: Printed for the Author; and sold by *John* and *Joseph Marshall* at the Bible in *Gracechurch-Street*, and at the Bible in *Newgate-street*. M D C C X V. Price 1 s.

Y 110 10 21

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

1111 1111 1111 1111 1111

T O T H E
Impartial and Unprejudic'd
READER,

Who desires to be Rightly Inform'd in the Nature and Design of Cod's Covenant with *Abraham*, (his Friend) in the behalf of Himself and all his Ecclesiastical (or Church) Seed, both among *Jews* and *Gentiles*; to the End of the World.

Courteous Reader,

IF the Spirit of Grace reigns in thy Heart, thou wilt (I doubt not) readily believe me, (especially when I most solemnly profess, as if I were (immediately) to be call'd to the Bar of the Great Judge) that no Prejudice (or Hatred) against the Persons of the People, who (without any Warrant from God's Word) Style themselves Baptists, and Baptiz'd Churches of Christ, hath stirr'd me up to appear in print, in opposing those pernicious Principles, which the Men of that Persuasion do (with so much Violence and un-

A 2

scriptural

To the Reader.

Scriptural Zeal) Teach and Maintain. I sincerely bless God, that his good Spirit hath taught me to distinguish between Persons, and the Errors which they hold and maintain. Their Persons I love, and am really griev'd that I love them no more than I do. And I hope neither they nor any others will be angry with me for so doing: But their Errors (in Religion) I do from my Heart abominate and loath, because hateful to God, and all good Men, who know and understand them so to be. And for thus doing, I neither fear a Frown from God, nor yet Blame from any Man, (truly wise) who is able to distinguish Truth from Error.

That I shall be censur'd and (uncharitably) reflected on, for what I have done, in printing this small Tract, I am not insensible: I am very sure none will thus do, but such as either know not, or care not what they say.

These kind of Blows I am taught to ward off with a Religious Scorn and a Holy Contempt; resolving (in Christ's Strength) to pursue and hold fast the Truth of God, let who will bark and cavil against it. It was the Saying of Valerius Maximus, *Æquo Animo ferenda sunt, Imperitorum Convitia, & ad Honesta vadenti, Contemnendus est, iste Contemplus.* The Reproaches (saith he) of the Ignorant and Unskilful are to be born with an even (or patient) Mind:

And

To the Reader.

And he that intends to advance towards Good and Honest things, must contemn their Contempt. That somewhat will come out in answer hereto, I question not, (if the Men of that Principle have not lost their old Wont) but (my Comfort and Confidence being built on the Rock of Ages) I never fear a Confutation from any, nay all, of that Perswasion, who breath on the Earth, until they procure (from Heaven) another Gospel, which is (Diametrically) opposite to the Gospel delivered by the Son of God, which I am sure will never be.

I have made no Deviation from the good old way chalkt out by Abraham's God, (wherein the Prophets and Apostles, with all the Primitive Churches, who are gone to Heaven, walkt in) that I know of: If I have, I do faithfully promise, that (upon the discovery of my Error,) I will own my self therein mistaken.

I have been (for several Years past) importun'd by many serious and godly Christians, to print what now I expect to be blam'd for, but never found my self (thereto) inclin'd, till of late; not that I question any part of what I have printed, being God's Truth; but indeed, the variety of Tryals and sharp Afflictions, which have (incessantly) followed me, since call'd to the Sacred Office, both in my Native City (Dublin) and also in England,

A 3 have

To the Reader.

have kept me back; together with my own great Aversion to appear in Print, in any Matters Controversial. But observing (of late) how strangely Anabaptism spreads both in City and Country; and being fully convinc'd, that Ignorance of (and Unacquaintedness with) the Covenant of Grace, was (and still is) that which hath given Advantage to the Preachers of that way, in drawing Proselytes after them, I have (in Conscience of my Duty, both to God and Men) improv'd my poor Talent, in explaining and opening up the Nature and Design of the Covenant of Grace, made with Abraham in Gen. 17. 7. in hopes, that God will bless the Plainness and Brevity therein us'd, to inform poor ignorant (and unthinking) Souls, how wretchedly they are imposed upon by Preachers of that Perswasion, who have (themselves) as great need to be instructed and taught, what the deep Mysteries of the Covenant of Grace be, as the poor (Tongue-ty'd, Babes, whom they (in vain) labour to exclude and shut out from the Benefits and Seal of that Covenant, in the Visible Churches of Christ. As their denying Abraham's Covenant, to be the Covenant of Grace, administers just ground of suspecting, whether they have any other than dark and confus'd Notions about the Doctrine of God's Free Grace, (so much spoken of in Pulpit and Print.)

To the Reader.

So their Unmercifulness and Hard heartedness to the Infants of believing Parents, in not allowing such to be accounted of the number of God's Elect, meerly because of the Incapacity of such, to make an open Profession of Faith and Repentance themselves, administers just ground of suspecting whether they be Orthodox in the Doctrine of Election. - I am very sure the State of Infancy can neither null or make void the Electing Decree of God, nor yet render the Elect Infant any way incapable of that Grace of God's Covenant to which he is Elected, or of the Seal of that Covenant of Grace in the Church Visible; for any to hold or say it doth, is to reflect on the most High God, and to make him a mutable Agent, like to a Fickle Man, contrary to Mal. 3. 6. Rom. 11. 29. and (unavoidably) to send all Elect Infants to Hell, (who die Infants) contrary to Mar. 10. 14. Jo. 6. 39. Rom. 11. 7. All that I shall farther say, is only to beg and pray thee, for the Lord's sake, for thy own Souls sake, and for that Love and Tenderneſs, which the Law of Nature (eſpecially that of Grace.) obliges thee to have for poor Infants, (if thou be a Parent) consider well, and weigh judiciously (in the Ballance of God's Sanctuary) the Arguments laid down in this small Tract, to prove what I have (therein) undertaken. If God bless the Reading thereof, to the keeping thee back from Esponsing the Errors herein

A 4 decry'd;

To the Reader.

decri'd; or if it should prove the occasion of thy Vomiting up (by sound Repentance and hearty Reformation) the love and liking thou hast had to those Principles of Darkness, give God the Glory of his own Grace, and suffer thy self no longer to be impos'd on by such Preachers, who are not only Intruders into the Sacred Office, but also Heterodox and Unsound, in what they teach concerning God's Covenant with Abraham, being a Covenant of Works; concerning Infants-Baptism, being but a Popish Invention, and a piece of Will-Worship; and what they Teach and confidently Affirm of dipping, being the only right Mode of Baptizing commanded by Christ, and practis'd by John and all the first Baptizers; By which Principles they raise the very Foundation of Salvation to grown Believers, as well as to their Infants: And disown, that Christ hath any right Gospel Churches but themselves: From which Principles I shall ever say, and heartily pray, Good Lord Deliver me, and all the Families of thy Faithful People.

INTRODUCTION.

An occasional Discourse between a Minister and a Church Member, concerning Infant Baptism; wherein sundry material Questions are put by the Church Member; and plainly and particularly Answered by the Minister, for the Information of the Ignorant, and the Satisfaction of such as are staggering in their Judgments, about the Lawfulness of Infants-Baptism.

Minister. Brother Edward, By what I have heard from some of my Neighbours, as also by the Discourse which past between you and me when last together, I suspect that some have been tampering with you, to draw you away to Anabaptism; is it so or no? deal plainly, to the end I might address my self to my Duty, in giving you satisfaction herein, from God's Word.

Church Member. I must ingeniously acknowledge, Sir, that I am not without wavering, and doubtful Thoughts in my Mind about Infant-Baptism, occasioned partly, by discoursing with some of that Way and Perswasion; partly by reading some Books which were put into my hand; which to

The Introduction.

me seems full of Clearness, that Infant-Baptism is no way warrantable or justifiable by the Gospel of Christ.

Minist. I find then that I am not mistaken in my Apprehension of you in this Matter: but for your Encouragement, I must tell you, that you are but tryed herein by a Temptation; for which I think never the worse of your Souls State, neither are my Hopes and Confidence of your Integrity towards God, a jot or whit lessened by the Inclination in your Mind to favour that Opinion; for I have known some very Holy and upright Hearted Christians, who in the Simplicity of their Hearts, have strongly inclined to favour and espouse that Cause and Principle, as the most plausible, and likely to agree with the Gospel, there being no Attention at all of Infant-Baptism in the Gospel, neither in Precept, nor yet in Example, to recommend it; yea, I my self have (in my first setting out in the ways of Christianity) met with Temptations to draw me to that Opinion; and that by the very same means which hath occasioned your staggering herein. And the main things which induced me to hanker after that Principle, were, (1.) The high and charitable Opinion I had of some of that Party, being Men of high Attainments in Grace and Gospel Holiness. (2.) There appearing to me no Command for Infant-Baptism in all the Gospel, nor yet any one Instance where it is said that

The Introduction.

that such were Baptized. (3.) The many Quotations of Learned Divines and Councils, which the Anabaptists Books assured me were all of their Judgment and Perswasion herein; which much startled, and sway'd me to kind Apprehensions of their way. (4.) Their branding Infant - Baptism with the black Brand of Will-Worship and Popery; against both which I always had (since I knew Christ in the Gospel of his Grace) and ever shall have (I humbly hope in Christ) a Mortal Dislike, and rooted Hatred. By means of the four particulars now mentioned, I was drawn to the very Verge or Brink of Anabaptism, being just on the point of renouncing my Baptism (received in my Infant State) as being a meer Nullity or no Baptism at all. My roving Spirit thus fluctuating and tossing between the Waves and Billows of doubtful and distracting Cogitations: what I had best to do in this Case; whether to offer my self to be Dipt, yea, or not? or to address my self to Ministers of the contrary Judgment for Resolution, (in so weighty and material a point:) Matters being thus, I providentially and happily happened into the Company of some of the Congregational Perswasion, Men no whit inferiour to those I so much admired, (for Piety) and Holiness and who (I very well knew) were able to instruct and teach the others for Matter of Learning and deep Knowledge in the Mysteries of the Gospel.

The Introduction.

Gospel: These debating sundry points in Controversie between the Anabaptists and the Orthodox, Protestant, Reformed Churches, concerning Infant-Baptism; I apprehended and saw so far into the Mystery of Baptism, that I was at a stand, and began to question whether I was not under a Delusion and disliking my Infant-Baptism, received in Infancy; by means hereof I was stirred up to Pray earnestly to God, that his good Spirit might teach and guide me in the way of Gospel-Truth; which was seconded by a diligent search into the Holy Scripture, and a careful Reading and weighing the Arguments brought by both Parties, both for and against Infant-Baptism. And in a short time (through the special Assistance of the Spirit of Christ) I was enabled to see and understand that there was nothing of solid weight in the Reasons brought against Infant-Baptism, but what are in reality repugnant, and contradictory to the Word of God: as will (I hope) in time, most plainly appear to your Understanding. I have been the more prelix in speaking my Experience herein, that you might become sensible, that even Godly Men might be entangled in erroneous Opinions. And to let you know what be the ordinary means to escape the Nets of Crafty Men, who lye in wait to ensnare poor, unstable (though Honest and well-meaning) Souls. Now, as Christ (my Lord and Master) said to Peter, after his

The Introduction.

his Recovery from his Fall : When thou art Converted, strengthen thy Brethren, Luke 22. So I am now come, as my Duty binds me, to endeavour your Recovery, and full Satisfaction in these Points, about Infant-Baptism, wherein you seem to stagger.

Church-Member. I hope I can say (thro' special Grace) that I am no way fond of Errour : But what I do herein, I do it really from my Conscience, according to the Light thereof : I hope, Sir, you will not blame me for acting according thereto.

Minist. I am far from arraigning your Integrity to God, being very sensible that herein you are but under a Temptation, as stronger Christians than you or I have been, and now are ; neither shall I (in the least) attempt to press you to act herein against your Conscience : Conscience (I am sensible) is a tender thing, which is to be informed, not violently impell'd or forced. I hope you have the same Charity for me, as to believe that what I do act in Baptizing the Infant Seed of encovenanted Parents, and pleading for such ; I do the same from my Conscience, being fully perswaded that what I do herein, is according to the Word of God : But though I do not take on me to force or lord it over your Conscience, I hope you will, without Offence, give me leave to use the freedom of a Pastor with you, in doing two things, in order to recover you

The Introduction.

you. The first is to reprove you for going out of the way of Duty, in exposing your Conscience to those Soul deluding Entanglements, which have occasioned your present Disturbance, and Unsettledness in your Principles, by deluding Entanglements; I mean your going out of the way of your Calling, to stare and gaze (out of Curiosity) at the Plunging of Persons under the Water; which (albeit) you and others may think may be done without either Offence to your Brethren, or any kind of Danger to yourself, - hath in it an insatuating, charming Energie, to allure and draw into a liking of it. Your frequent discoursing with Men of that Principle, who (you very well know) glory not a little in Profelyting People to that way: And your so much delighting to Read their Books, being not able to grapple with such subtille Enemies; the Deceit of whose Arguments lyes covered under a false Vizard. By these your Practises you have filled the Eyes of your Conscience so full of that Dust and Smoak, which is always raised by doubtful Disputations; that for want of your Monitor, (your Conscience I mean) you are now at an apparent stand in those ways of Truth wherein you ought to run swiftly; and well it were if you had been at a stand before you had so far advanced in these unscriptural Tenents: But however, (seeing you are not ascended so high (in these Errors) as to be seated in the Scorn-

ers

The Introduction.

ers-Chair, to laugh at and deride Baby-sprinkling, as a piece of Will-Worship and meer Popery; as the Anabaptists are well known to term and account Infant-Baptism: (not for want of Ignorance and Prejudice, the Lord knows.) I shall now in the second place endeavour to help you out of this Quagmire, into which your own incautelousness and sinful Curiosity hath (by the Art of a subtile Adversary) involved you: In order then to a speedy helping you herein, I desire you will reduce those things wherein you desire to be satisfied (about Infant Baptism) to as few Heads, (and in as plain a Method) as you possibly can, and then I shall endeavour to answer your Objections; wherein (I faithfully promise you) I shall most freely refer my self to the Word of God, and to the Writings of those Divines now in Glory: At whose Writings the Wifest of Anabaptists are glad to light their Candle, though in the point of Baptism they are accounted neither able nor worthy to teach them. And when you and I are come to Conclusion, you in objecting, and I in answering, it will then appear whether Infant-Baptism be any part of Will-Worship or meer Popery, as it is represented by its Adversaries.

Church-Memb. Sir, I like your Proposal very well, and in compliance with your reasonable Request, as also in order to my own Satisfaction, I shall reduce those particulars

The Introduction.

culars wherein I desire to be satisfied, to 3 General Heads, under each of which I hope you will give me Liberty to propose, by way of Objection, what I think convenient and fit to start.

Minist. *I like very well to hear you name but 3 General Heads; I hope you will observe Order and Method in what you intend to Object under those 3 Heads.*

Church-Memb. I will observe Order and Method as well as I can; and shall (I hope) with becoming Candor, weigh in the Balance of an impartial and unprejudicate Consideration and Judgment, what Strength appears to be in your Answer; and in case I find my Conscience satisfied by the Strength of your Answer, I shall readily own it, and give Glory to God.

Minist. *I desire you to name the 3 General Heads, for fear we should forget them when we come to be earnest in our Dispute.*

Church Memb. The 3 General Heads which I propose to be satisfied in, are as follow: 1. The Covenant which God made with Abraham, mentioned in Gen. 17. 7. 2. The Seal of that Covenant. And 3. The Subjects who have a visible Right to that Covenant and the Seal thereof. Under these 3 Heads, I suppose, may be brought in all that I need to say.

Minist.

The Introduction.

Minist. *As touching your first General Head, viz. The Covenant which God made with Abraham, What would you be at, about it.*

Church Memb. I would pray you to clear it up from the Word of God, that that Covenant is a Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works; for the Apprehension I always had, till of late, that that Covenant was the Covenant of Grace, was the Foundation whereon my former Principle, viz, Infant-Baptism was founded; but being informed and taught otherwise, both by Mens Preaching, and also by their Books; I am much in doubt as touching the lawfulness of Infant-Baptism.

Minist. *I perceive then you apprehend that Infant Baptism is like to stand or fall, as the Covenant of God with Abraham, is proved to be either a Covenant of Grace or otherwise; What if it be made good from the Word of God, that the Covenant of God with Abraham is a Covenant of meer Grace?*

Church Memb Truly, to be plain and ingenious, I cannot see how Infant-Baptism can stand, if that Covenant be a Covenant of Works; as I am sensible the Baptists hold and teach it is; and which I am inclined, under my present light, to judge it must be as they say. But in case it be proved otherwise, I plainly see the Anabaptists

The Introduction.

tists are like to suffer a miserable Shipwrack; for their holding and teaching that God's Covenant with Abraham is a Covenant of Works, is the principal Pillar, on which almost all their Arguments against Infant-Baptism lean. If that Pillar then be shaken and overthrown by Scriptural Arguments, the whole structure will tumble of course.

Minist. *I am very glad that You and I do (in any measure) agree in our Sentiments about this matter; to let you see then, how sandy a Foundation the Anabaptists build on, I shall begin to lay down some Scriptural Arguments, to prove them most heterodox and unsound in this point of Abraham's Covenant, wherein they do most evidently rase the very Foundation of Life and Salvation to Abraham himself, and all his Seed.*

C H A P. I.

Of God's Covenant with Abraham, wherein is plainly proved, that that Covenant, in Gen. 17. 7. is the Covenant of Grace.

TH A T God's Covenant with *Abraham*, in *Gen. 17. 7.* was, and still is, the Covenant of Grace, dispensed in a Church way: None of the Orthodox ever did (or do) deny, that I can find. That the taking that Covenant in this Sense, is the Foundation Principle, on which all sound Protestants do maintain and justify the Right of Believers Infants to Baptism, is beyond Contradiction.

When the Most High and Sovereign Lord God saw fit to make known his Will and Pleasure, to be; that his Covenant of Grace, (agreed on, between himself, and his Son Christ in Eternity) should be Dispensed in an Ecclesiastical (or Church) way, he singles out (above all other Men) *Abraham* his Friend; on whom he confers the Honourable Title, of the *Father of the Faithful*, *Rom. 4. 11.* Not that *Abraham* did, or could (possibly) beget a Believer (as such) or could convey into the Children he begat (according to Fleshly Generation)

ration) that noble Grace of Faith, where-with God's Free Gift had Blessed himself. But God opens and propounds his everlasting Covenant of Grace and Salvation to him, as a Publick Person, who was to Personate all true Believers; who (in after Ages) were to be Members of his Visible Churches, to the second coming of Christ.

The Sum and Substance of that Covenant, is briefly comprehended in the Words of Gen. 17. 7. *I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee, in their Generations, for an Everlasting Covenant; to be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee,*

This Covenant hath Two Essential Parts, as all Right Covenants have, (1.) God's part, held forth in the Words, *I will be a God to thee, &c.*

The meaning whereof (according to the Analogie of Faith,) must be thus understood. Tho' thou *Abraham*, whom I now call, to become my Friend and Favorite, and a Publick Head (or Representative) of all believing Church Members, to the end of the World; be'st an undone and guilty Sinner, polluted in thy Nature, and born under *Adam's* Covenant of Works; liable and obnoxious to its Curse, and to the Wrath to come; unable to recover or help thy self out of that deplorable Condition,

dition, into which thy natural Birth (as *Adam's Child*) hath put thee. And albeit, thou be no way worthy of any Favour, yet I think fit to let thee know, what Thoughts and Purposes of Mercy and Kindness, I have in store for thee, *Abraham*: And for the rest of mine Elect, whom I have chosen to my self in Christ, (the Promised Messiah,) of whom, that Son which I have promised thee, is to be a Type: And in whose Person, all mine Elect, are to be Allegorically (or Typically) Represented; and that as thy Son is to be a Type of mine, in whom I have elected and chosen them.

I frankly and freely pardon and forgive thee, all those Transgressions and Sins, wherewith, (as *Adam's Child*) thou standest chargeable, for breaking that Covenant of Works I made with *Adam*, thy (and all Mankinds) Natural and Federal Head.

I account thee perfectly Just and Righteous in my Sight, not by, or for, that Principal of Inherent Holiness, which the Spirit of Grace (in effectual Calling) hath wrought in thee, (which Inherent Holiness is (ever) the Fruit and Effect of a justified State; but never the procuring (or meriting) Cause. But I account and esteem thee, as Just and Righteous, as if thou

thou hadst (in thy own Person) exactly performed that legal Righteousness, which the Law Moral requires; on the alone account of my Son's Righteousness, which (as the Mediator and Surety of this my Covenant of Grace; he is to perform in the behalf of thee, and all mine Elect) I most freely impute to thee.

I sanctifie and renew thy vitiated and polluted Nature, by my sanctifying Spirit, that thou mayest be capable of Communion and Fellowship with me, both here, in my Church Militant; and hereafter, in my Church Triumphant.

I adopt thee to be my Son, by Grace; and by virtue hereof, thou art restored to all the Blessings, Rights and Privileges, which *Adam* (thy Natural and Federal Head) lost and forfeited, by his Apostacy and Defection: Hereby thou art admitted (as a free Denizon) into the Family and Household of God: From whence thou wast cast out (in *Adam*) when he was ejected and cast out for his Rebellion, witness his Expulsion out of Earthly Paradise, a lively Type of the Heavenly. I promise to establish thee in Grace, so as thou shalt never more be in danger of losing thy self, or forfeiting my Love and Favour any more: For ever I will be a Sun, and a Shield, to furnish and supply thee with all necessary Accom-

Accommodations for Life in this World ; I will protect and defend thee from all adverse Powers, Spiritually and Bodily, which shall contrive and seek thy Ruine. And, finally, I will receive thee into Heaven, when, by Death, thou goest hence ; where thou shalt Live and Reign, with me, Eternally.

And the very same Mercy and Favour which I have now expressed, and shewn to thee, I do oblige my self, by the Promise of this my Covenant, that I will do to all mine Elect, who are to spring from thy Loyns. As also, to all mine Elect, who are to come of the Gentile Race, to the end of the World.

(2.) Man's part : As for thee, *Abraham*, this thou must do, (on thy part) thou must walk Humbly and Uprightly before me ; thou must make the Moral Law (engraven by the Finger of my Spirit, on the Heart of *Adam*, thy Natural and Federal Head) the standing Rule of thy Obedience, both negatively and positively. In all the parts of thy Obedience, thou must look exactly to three things: 1. To the Subject Matter of thy Obedience, let it be what I command and require, not what Creatures devise or enjoin. 2. To the manner. See that thou do it in Faith, keeping thine Eye on Christ (my Son)
for

for Acceptance, and acting all by strength derived from him. 3. To the End. See that my Glory be that thou aimest at, and designest, in all thou goest about. Thou shalt not do my Work and Service in a Mercenary way, as a Servant that Works for Wages; but thou must obey my Command as a Son, with Freedom of Spirit, and from a Principle of Love and Gratitude, knowing and considering, that my Grace and Love hath made Provision of all that is needful, to make thee (every way eternally happy, both here and hereafter. The dreadful Curse, and eternal Death, to which (by Sin) thou becamest obnoxious: My Son Christ (Typ'd out by the Ram) hath set thee for ever free from it. And that by his being made a Curse, and undergoing Death for thee, (as being thy Sponsor or Surety) at his Hands I have received, the full of that Debt, whereto thou becamest liable, by breaking my Law, there remains not the least Mite for thee to pay; so that (now) thou hast no Cause to fear my Vindictive Justice; the many and sharp Afflictions, wherewith thou shalt meet, in thy way to Glory, shall be but the gentle Chastisements, of thy (dearly) loving, and reconciled Father; who (by them) will purge out the remains of thy indwelling Corruption.

ruption: and sweetly wean thee from the enticing Objects of the vain and bewitching World thou livest in. That Perfect and Spotless Righteousness, which must Recommend thee to me, and present thee Blameless, before the Throne of my Glorious Holiness, in the Third Heaven, is (Subjectively) Inherent in the Person of God-Man, thy Mediator and Surety; to this Mediatorial Righteousness of his, thou shalt add nothing, neither thy own Personal Qualifications; nor yet, the Holiness of Saints or Angels; (as if thereby) thou couldest be made more acceptable, than that Righteousness of his doth make thee. Thou shalt keep my Covenant, both thou and all thy Ecclesiastical (or Church) Seed, throughout your Generations, till my Son comes to Judge the World at the last Day. Thou, and all thy Church Seed, (which Springs from thee by Fleshly Generation,) shall observe to have all your Males mark'd with Circumcision, the visible Token and Seal of this my Gracious Covenant, which I have (now) entred into, with thee; for thy self (a stipulating Father,) and for all thy Children; who are to be the Members of my Son's Mediatorial Kingdom; or Visible Church on the Earth.

And when Christ my Son shall come in the Flesh, and shall enter upon his Mediatorial

rial Kingdom, whatever visible Token or Seal he shall appoint to succeed in the room of Circumcision, thy Gentile Church Seed (as well as Jews,) who are to believe in him, shall (carefully) observe to be Sealed therewith, both they and their Infants : And that by Virtue of this my Covenant, I now make with thee, for thy self and them. And to the end, that neither thou, nor thy Children (in succeeding Ages) may be ignorant of what my Will and Pleasure is, concerning the Non-Elect, who are to come and spring from Believing and Holy Parents, in my visible Church or Churches, I notifie to thee, and thy Church Seed after thee, (throughout their Generations) that my Sovereign Will and Pleasure is, that all the Infants of my Believing, Professing Church Members, shall be markt with the visible Token or Seal, of this my Covenant in the Church, whereof the Professing Parent (or Parents) are Members, and that without any Regard had to the Elect, or Non-Elect. For, seeing that the Secrets of my Decrees and Councils are known to my self alone, I will that thou, and thy Church Seed after thee, (to the end of the World) do, in the Judgment of (rational) Charity, judge all the Seed, and Infant Posterity of my professing People, who have laid hold on my Covenant, (by an eternal, visible Profession)

fession) to belong to the Election, and to own them for such, until they (by open Apostacy, and final Impenitency) do manifest the contrary. For albeit my Visible Churches do consist of Elect, and Non-Elect, and the one as well as the other do partake of the Seal of my Covenant, and are Partakers of all Church Privileges ; yet none shall ever partake (internally and savingly) of the inward Grace and Mercy signified, and sealed by the Token and Seal of my Covenant, (in the Church Visible,) but the Elect only, whose Names are (particularly) Registred in the Lamb's Book of Life. And altho' the Non-Elect in my Church, do fall short of the saving Benefits of my Covenant of Grace ; yet shall they find that I am no way behind with them ; for, altho' I (the absolute Sovereign of the World) be no way obliged to the Creature (especially fallen Rebels,) yet, seeing it is my Pleasure to employ the Non-Elect in the Service of my Church, (while it is in a Militant State) that those common Gifts (of my Spirit) wherewith they are to be endowed, might be laid out and improved, for the good and welfare of my Elect and Chosen ; I will give them a Place in my Church, that they shall be called by my Name, and shall have an equal Right (with mine Elect) to the Seal of my Covenant,

and all outward Helps and means of Salvation, in the Church Visible; whereby it shall plainly appear, (in the Day of Judgment) that their missing Heaven, and falling short of eternal Life, was of their own Procurement. Notwithstanding, as is the Service wherein they are employ'd in my Church, I will give them a plentiful Recompence, (*viz.*) a Temporal Reward, in Lieu of a Temporal Service; Such as Bodily Health, Worldly Wealth, Pleasures and Honours, &c. which are (every way) more suitable to their Spirit, and are more sought and delighted in (by them) than are the things laid up for my Chosen: Plain Instances (hereof) I have seen fit to leave on Record, in the Persons of *Ishmael* and *Isaac*, both born of *Abraham*, (according to the Flesh) the one a Reprobate, the other Elect; both must be of the Church visible, and Sealed with the visible Token and Seal of God's Covenant with *Abraham*. Of the same Nature is that of *Esau* and *Jacob*, both born of *Isaac* (according to Fleahly Generation) yet the one a Reprobate, and the other Elect; both must be of the visible Church, and Sealed with the Seal of the Covenant, and pass (currant) for Church Members, (before Men) until they (themselves) make the contrary to appear: As did *Ishmael*, *Esau*, &c. And

And thus, having as plainly and as briefly as I could, (for the Information of these who are yet ignorant of *Abraham's* Covenant) explained and shewn the Substance and Tenure of God's Covenant with *Abraham*, for himself and all his Ecclesiastical, or Church Seed, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, to the end of the World.

I come now to lay down some Scriptural Arguments, to prove, that God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (as now explained) is the Covenant of Grace; which God propounded to *Abraham*, in *Gen. 17. 7*. And not a Covenant of Works, as the *Anabaptists* teach it is.

That it is the Covenant of Grace, and no other, will evidently appear to any, who look not asquint on the Arguments following.

Arg. 1. The first Argument is this. If God never yet made a Covenant of Works, with any (meer) Man, but that which he made with sinless *Adam* (the Natural and Federal Head of all Mankind) in the State of Innocency, before the Fall: Then God's Covenant with *Abraham* is the Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works. But God never (yet) made a Covenant of Works, with any meer Man, but that which he made with sinless *Adam*, (the natural and Federal Head of all Mankind) in the State of Innocency, before the

Fall: Therefore, God's Covenant with *Abraham*, in *Gen. 17. 7.* is the Covenant of Grace, and no other. Plain it is, and none (without Lying against God) can deny it, that God made a Covenant of Works with *Adam*, and in him with all Mankind.

The Condition whereof was, do and live; sin and die. And as plain it is, that *Adam* fell, by transgressing that Covenant; by which Fall he lost the Blessed Image of God to himself, and all his Posterity, whereby he and his Posterity became utterly incapable of Life and Salvation by that Covenant.

Now, *Abraham* being (by natural Birth) a Son of the first *Adam*, and (as such) born under the Curse of *Adam's* Covenant, and Partaker of a sinful and polluted Nature; which rendred him as incapable of performing any Work, which (as a Condition) can answer the Laws Demand; as a Man naturally dead, is incapable of raising or quickening himself; or as a Sparrow is incapable to remove, or carry on its Back, the greatest Mountain in the World. To what end should the only wise God make a Covenant of Works, with such a fallen Sinner?

Arg. 2. If to hold and teach, that God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (in *Gen. 17. 7.*) is

is a Covenant of Works, and not a Covenant of Grace, be a high Reflection on God, and also destructive to the Souls of Men; then is God's Covenant with *Abraham* (in *Gen. 17. 7.*) the Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works. But to hold and teach, that God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (in *Gen. 17. 7.*) is a Covenant of Works, and not a Covenant of Grace, is a high Reflection on God, and destructive to the Souls of Men.

Therefore, God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (*Gen. 17. 7.*) is the Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works.

For rendring this Argument unanswerable, Two things want Confirmation. *First*, That to hold and teach, that God's Covenant with *Abraham* is a Covenant of Works, is a high Reflection on God. And *Secondly*, That the same is destructive to the Souls of Men.

The *First* of these will evidently appear, to the unprejudic'd and impartial Reader, if he (seriously) consider how Inconsistent it is, with the Divine Attributes of God, to make a Covenant of Works, with a Lapsed, Polluted Sinner, whom he knows to be (altogether) Dead in Trespases and Sins, and (every way) as unable to will, or do, any Work that is

(Spiritually) good, as a Dead Man is able to quicken and raise himself.

For Illustration sake, let it be considered, how unbecoming a Wise and Prudent Man it would be, to strike a Covenant (or Bargain) for ten, or twenty thousand Pounds, with an insolvent Person, who is well known not to be worth ten Farthings in the World ; and (which is yet worse) who hath neither Wit to contrive, nor Health or Limbs to work to get a Penny towards paying such a vast Sum. I cannot so much as doubt of any (worldly wise) Man's Unwillingness to be guilty of such an oversight as this : And shall the (Unerringly) Wise God, be guilty of so great an Absurdity ?

Secondly, As this Principle Reflects on God ; so it is Destructive to the Souls of Men. This appears (beyond all Contradiction,) in that it raseth the very Foundation of Mens Salvation : by denying that Covenant to be a Covenant of Grace, which *Abraham* and *Isaac*, with *Jacob*, and all the *Old Testament* Believers depended on for eternal Salvation ; and by which, we (Gentile Believers) hope to go to Heaven. For, most plain it is, that by this pernicious Principle, *Abraham* is lost, with all who died trusting to the Grace exhibited in that Covenant. And if *Abraham* (the Father of the Faithful) be trust-
ing

ing to a Covenant of Works; I cannot see, how any of his Ecclesiastical Church Seed can be Saved, any more than he is. For, by a Covenant of Works, no meer Man ever was, or shall be justified and saved.

Arg. 3. If the Scripture no where (either directly or by Consequence) calls God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (*Gen. 17. 7.*) a Covenant of Works; then it is a Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works. But the Scripture no where (either directly or by consequence,) calls God's Covenant with *Abraham*, a Covenant of Works: Therefore the Covenant of God with *Abraham*, is the Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works.

If it cannot be demonstrated from the written Word, or by Arguments deducible therefrom, that *Abraham's* Covenant, *Gen. 17. 7.* is called, (or can be proved) a Covenant of Works; They who so hold and teach, will be found ranked among those who call Good, Evil; and Evil, Good; and who put *Light for Darkness, and Darkness for Light*, *Isa. 5. 10.* For Men to take on them, to term *Abraham's* Covenant a Covenant of Works, without any Warrant Divine, is (to me) an Argument of an ignorant, rash and presumptuous Spirit: from which Charge, let such Men

see how they can acquit and free themselves.

Arg. 4. If Abraham was justified by Faith, and not by Works; then the Covenant which God made with him, is the Covenant of Grace, and not of Works. But *Abraham* was justified by Faith, and not by Works; Therefore the Covenant which God made with him, is the Covenant of Grace, and not the Covenant of Works. That *Abraham* was justified by Faith, and not by Works, the Scripture is express and clear, *Rom. 4. 2, 3, 4. Gal. 2. 5, 6, 7.*

Arg. 5. If God hath made no other Covenant of Grace with *Abraham*, distinct from that in *Gen. 17. 7.* then, that Covenant in *Gen. 17. 7.* is the Covenant of Grace: but God made no Covenant of Grace, with *Abraham*, distinct from that in *Gen. 17. 7.* Therefore that Covenant in *Gen. 17. 7.* is the Covenant of Grace, and not the Covenant of Works.

That which will determine the Point in Controversie, is this, let those who (herein) oppose me, lay down a Scriptural Definition of the Covenant of Grace; and that in such Terms, as best please themselves; and in Case, their own Definition, do not agree (at least for Substance) with *Gen. 17: 7.* if it be according to God's Word, then am I freely willing to own my self (herein) mistaken:

If they refuse to comply with so fair a Proposal, let the judicious and impartial Reader judge, who is at the Loss (herein) they or I?

I conclude this Chapter with this *Dilemma*, (viz.) *Abraham*, (the Father of the Faithful) he is either sav'd, or else he is damn'd; one of these two the Adversaries (I now oppose) must grant; for there is no middle State for the Souls departed.

If they say he is damn'd, then there is no Ground left us to hope, that any of *Adam's* Posterity ever were or shall be sav'd; for we have no other Covenant whereby to expect Salvation, but that of *Abraham*: And if he Perished under that Covenant, so must we.

If they grant, that *Abraham* is in a State of Salvation, (as they must, if they speak by the Spirit of Christ) then *Abraham* was justified and saved by a Covenant of Grace, and if by a Covenant of Grace, then that Covenant mention'd in *Gen. 17. 7.* must needs be the Covenant of Grace; for besides that Covenant the Scriptures know no other.

Against what I have said, (and all Orthodox Protestants constantly hold and affirm) concerning *Abraham's* Covenant being a Covenant of pure and absolute Grace; this is objected by the Adversaries.

Object. *The Land of Canaan was a Temporal Blessing ; therefore such was the Covenant, of which Circumcision was a Temporary Seal.*

I answer in two Particulars. First, The Promise of the Land of *Canaan* is no Essential part of the Covenant of *Abraham*. Let the Words in the 7th Verse be Read without Prejudice. The last Clause of the Verse doth fully comprehend the Sum and Substance of the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*. The Promise of the Land of *Canaan* is only by way of Addition or Overplus. No Essential part of the Covenant it self. The Covenant is briefly comprehended in these Words, *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee* : For in these Words God engages himself (by free and absolute Promise) to *Abraham* and to his Elect Church-Seed, that he will be a God to him and them, to do all things for them which are needful to compleat their Happiness, both here and hereafter.

Secondly, The Land of *Canaan* was promised not as it was any Essential part of the Covenant of Grace ; or, as if real Blessedness consisted in the actual Enjoyment thereof: But as the same was a Temporary Type of Heaven. And for want of Understanding and considering this very thing, many, who have thought themselves wiser

wiser (in the Myſteries of the Goſpel) than their Neighbours, have prov'd themſelves ſhort of true Wiſdom; in this Particular at leaſt.

To convince of this Miſtake, let that of our Saviour (in *Mat. 6. 33. But ſeek ye firſt the Kingdom of God, and the Righteouſneſs thereof, and all theſe things ſhall be added to you*) be weighed in the Ballance of an unprejudiced Conſideration, and to an impartial Eye that looks not aſquint at theſe two places of holy Scripture, *Gen. 17. 7.* and *Mat. 6. 33.* it will moſt plainly appear, that Temporal Bleſſings are held forth in one, as well as in the other. And if it muſt needs be granted, that becauſe God made the Promise of the Land of *Canaan* to *Abraham*, &c. that therefore God's Covenant with him and his, was a Covenant of Works: It will as neceſſarily follow, that Believers, to whom Chriſt directs his Speech in *Mat. 6. 33.* are now under a Covenant of Works as well as *Abraham* was. And ſo, neither *Abraham* (the Father of the Faithful) nor any of his Seed, (the Elect I mean) either of the *Jewiſh* or *Gentile* Race, are like to be ſaved or enjoy God for their Portion. And by this way of arguing, it will evidently appear to any ſeeing Man, (who ſhuts not his Eyes for fear of being convinced) that while the Adverſaries (I now
oppose

oppose in this Controversie) were employed in devising this Shift to prove God's Covenant (with *Abraham*) to be a Covenant of Works; and that (on purpose) to exclude poor Infants from that Covenant, and from Baptism (the now Seal thereof,) they have (insensibly) shut both *Abraham* and themselves too out from being saved: and what Advantage will (hereby) accrew to their Cause, let it be improved to the utmost.

Object. 2. *It is again Objected, If the Covenant in Gen. 17. 7. be a Covenant of pure Grace, and not a Covenant of Works, and that all Abraham's Children be alike interested therein, then doth Grace come by natural Generation, contrary both to Scripture and Reason.*

Ans. The ground of the Objector's Mistake lies in two things: *First*, his not distinguishing or considering, that the Children of Believing *Abraham*, are said to be in Covenant two Ways, or in a twofold Respect: *First*, Internally, by Virtue of God's Election: And thus none are (or ever shall be) in Covenant, but *Abraham's* Seed, (*viz.*) The Elect, who are in Scripture (by way of Distinction) styled, the Children of Promise, Typ'd out in the Person of *Isaac*, *Gal. 4. 28.*

These (and they alone) partake in the saving Benefits of the Covenant; and have
also

also a Right to the visible Sign or Seal of the Covenant in the Visible Churches of Christ, under the Gospel Dispensation.

Secondly, Externally, by Virtue of the External Profession made in the Church: And thus the Non-Elect (as well as the Elect) are said to be in Covenant with God, in his Churches Visible, (here on Earth.) These albeit, they never partake in the saving Blessings of the Covenant; yet by Virtue of the External Profession made, they and their Infant Seed, (though not Elect,) have an External Right (in the Church Visible) to the Token (or Seal) of *Abraham's* Covenant; and to all other Privileges and Ordinances in the Church, whereof they are capable, according to the Revealed Will of God: By Virtue hereof it is, that God calls such his People; and he will have his Church to call and own them for such too, until they manifest themselves to be otherwise; and that by a voluntary Defection, and final Apostacy. Plain Instances hereof are (Graphically) set down in God's Word, in the Persons of *Ishmael* and *Esau*, (in whose Persons the Reprobate Seed of *Abraham* were (Allegorically) typ'd out as the Elect Seed) were Allegorically and Typically represented in the Persons of *Isaac* and *Jacob*. The former of these sprang from the Flesh of *Abraham*, as well as the latter:

latter : And on this Account they had a place in the Visible Church, and were marked with the Seal of God's Covenant, as well as the latter. They were esteemed and reckoned as God's Children, and true Members of the Church, until (by Defection and Apostacy,) they discovered themselves to be otherwise. If this Distinction be not allowed, I cannot see how God can be (orderly) Worshipt by any Visible Church on Earth.

This is the Sum and Substance of God's Covenant, made with *Abraham* in *Gen. 17.* 7. and with his Elect Seed, &c. And by Virtue of this Promise, *Abraham* and (with him) all his Elect Seed would have been most Happy and eternally Blest, had no Promise been made of the Land of *Canaan*. So (in like manner,) shall all true Believers, with their Elect Seed, be eternally Happy and Blest, being made Partakers of the Righteousness of Christ, (intended in *Mat. 6. 33.*) Albeit such Believers (and their Elect Seed) should (with *Lazarus*) Die on a Dunghil, for want of those Temporal Blessings held forth by Christ, in the above-mentioned Promise, which plainly demonstrates, that the Promise which God made to *Abraham*, of giving to him and to his Seed, the Land of *Canaan*, was no more an Essential part of the Covenant made with

with him and his Seed, than the Promise held forth by Christ, in the place (above-named) proves, that Believers and their Elect Seed are (now) under a Covenant of Works. All the Difference which I can find between these two places, is, that the Promise in *Gen. 17. 7.* was Typical of the Kingdom of Heaven. The other is not so. Were this Covenant of God made with *Abraham* (the Father of the Faithful) as he was a Stipulating and a Covenanting Representative (in a Church Visible,) but rightly understood and believ'd with Application to Mens own Souls, I am perswaded there would be neither *Anabaptists* nor *Arminians* in the World.

The Church of *Rome* holds and teaches, that Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion: I am not ashamed to say, it is the Mother of all Errors in Religion. Neither am I afraid to affirm it to be both the Mother and Nurse of *Anabaptism* and *Arminianism*.

CHAP. II.

Proving that Circumcision was a Seal of God's Covenant of Grace, made with Abraham, and his Seed.

Arg. 1. **E**ither Circumcision was the external Token (or Seal) of *Abraham's*

ham's Covenant (of Grace) mentioned, *G. 17.*

7. Or else that Covenant had no Seal at all.

The Adversary cannot avoid here, He must either grant or deny; if he grant that Circumcision was the Seal of *Abraham's* Covenant, I have what I was to prove; if he deny it to be the Seal of that Covenant, then it lies at his Door to demonstrate what was the Seal of that Covenant: If he say that that Covenant had no Seal at all, He will (thereby) not only gainsay the Word of God, but also speak against Reason; for all Men know it is an essential Property of a Covenant to have a Seal, to confirm the Matter contained in the Covenant.

Arg. 2. If Circumcision is by (God himself-) called the Seal of the Covenant, then is it (beyond all Controversie) the Seal of the Covenant.

But Circumcision is (by God himself) called the Seal of the Covenant.

Therefore Circumcision is (beyond all Controversie) the Seal of the Covenant. For Proof of the Argument, compare *Acts 7. 8.* with *Gen. 17. 10.* To which I will only add, *Rom. 4. 11.* which will put the matter (in Dispute) beyond the reach of all Dispute. The Words are plain and express, in calling Circumcision the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith; which plainly proves two things. First, That Circum-

-cision

cision is a Seal of the Covenant made with *Abraham*. Secondly, That the Covenant of which Circumcision was the Seal, was the Covenant of Grace, and no other.

CHAP. III.

That Water Baptism succeeded, or came in the room of Circumcision, (under the Gospel Dispensation) I prove by three convincing Arguments.

Arg. I. **I**F there be no other Initiatory Seal appointed by Christ under the Gospel but Water-Baptism, then is Water-Baptism come (or succeeded) in the room of Circumcision, to be the initiating Seal under the Gospel: But there is no other initiatory Seal appointed by Christ under the Gospel, but Water-Baptism.

Therefore Water-Baptism is come or succeeded in the room of Circumcision, to be the initiatory Seal under the Gospel.

The Truth and Strength of this Argument will the more clearly appear, by duly considering, that Circumcision was (under the dark Dispensation of the Law,) the initiating Seal of the Covenant, which will not, cannot be denied, unless by Men who understand (or care) not what they say; That Water-Baptism is, (and must be) so now;

now ; must (of necessity) be acknowledged by all who own that the Lord's-Supper succeeded, or came in the room of the Passover.

I humbly conceive no wise Man will oppose me, in saying, that the Churches of the New-Testament have as great need of an initiating Seal of the Covenant of Grace, as had the Church of the *Jews* under the Old : And if Baptism be not that Seal, I know not what is; for that Circumcision is (now) abrogated and abolished under the Gospel, none can deny ; and that some other visible Sign must succeed (or come) in its room, must be granted by them who acknowledge that the Lord's Supper succeeded (or came) in the room of the Passover.

Arg. 2. If the Adversaries themselves do (practically) own Baptism to be the initiating Seal of the Gospel Covenant, then Baptism is the initiating Seal of the Gospel Covenant: But the Adversaries themselves do (practically) own Baptism to be the initiating Seal of the Gospel Covenant. Therefore Baptism is the initiating Seal of the Gospel Covenant.

Those I (here) dispute against, before they can overthrow this Argument, must abandon their own Practice in making Baptism by Dipping, the Door of Entrance into their Churches; by which Practice they unchurch

unchurch all other Churches who are not of their own Perswasion. It is well known in *London*, and elsewhere, where *Anabaptism* is practised, that they make Baptism (by Dipping) the Form of a right Gospel Church; on which account it is they refuse Communion (in the Lord's-Supper) with the most sanctified Believers, if they are not Dipt after their Mode.

'Tis true, that some of that Perswasion would seem more moderate and charitable than others, (of that way) while they make Saintship the (only) term of Church Communion: These seem not to lay such stress on Baptism as the rest of that Perswasion do; they will admit to the Lord's-Supper (with them) those of other Perswasions, though not Baptized in their way; but how such will be able to justify their Practice in admitting Unbaptized Persons to the Lord's Supper, I cannot understand; to me it is plain that there is the same Parity of Reason for keeping back an unbaptized Person from the Lord's-Table, as there was for keeping back an uncircumcised Person from the Passover of Old. The first of these (*viz.*) Baptism, is the visible Badge of our Union (with Christ) in Regeneration, (as Circumcision was to the Believing Jews) The other (*viz.*) the Lord's-Supper, is the visible Badge of our Communion and Fellowship with Christ,

Christ, as the Passover (of old) was to the Believing Circumcised *Jews*: Now, as Communion is a Fruit of Union, and follows after it, so no Person ought to be admitted to the second, that is not (actually) a visible Partaker of the first. It is not to be doubted, that these who (in Charity) invite us to the Lord's Table (with them) do account us as Unbaptized Persons, while they reckon our Baptism (received in Infancy, and by Sprinkling) but a meer nullity, that is, no Baptism at all.

Arg. 3. If Water Baptism have the same end and use assigned it by God, as Circumcision had of old, *viz.* to signify and seal to Believers and their Infants Elect, the Truth of their Regeneration, &c. Then Water-Baptism hath succeeded in the room of Circumcision. But Water-Baptism hath the same end and use assign'd it by God, as Circumcision had of old, (*viz.*) to signify, and seal to Believers (and their Elect Infants,) the Truth of their Regeneration, &c. Therefore, Water-Baptism hath succeeded, in the room of Circumcision.

This Argument depends on the right and genuine Explication of that Text in *Colos. 2. 11.* *In whom also ye are Circumcised, with the Circumcision made without Hands; in putting off the Body of the Sins of the*

the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ, Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also, you are risen with him, through the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raised him from the Dead.

I shall not here meddle with explaining this, because, I shall have occasion to speak to it when I come to answer the Objections brought against Baptism being come in the room of Circumcision: whereto I refer my Reader.

Against what hath been said, concerning Circumcision being the Seal of the Covenant of Grace, &c. it is objected thus:

Object. *Circumcision was only a Seal of a Temporal, Carnal Covenant, Sealing only Earthly and Temporal Blessings, to the Carnal Church of the Jews.*

Ans. To this Objection, I answer in three Particulars.

1. I have already proved, that God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (of which Circumcision was the Seal) was (and still is) the Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works, as some ignorant and injudicious Teachers would fain have it to be: and that (meerly) on the Account of keeping poor Infants from Baptism, which they know could never be justified, (by God's Word) should they judiciously acknowledge, that *Abraham's* Covenant

is the Covenant of Grace ; and that Circumcision, was the Seal thereof : and that Water-Baptism, is (now) come in the room thereof.

2. In that some have reflected on that Covenant, calling it a carnal Covenant of Works, and the Church which was to observe and practise Circumcision (the Seal thereof) a carnal Church : all I need to say (by way of Reply) is, to bewail the Carnality of their Uncircumcised Hearts and Lips ; who have no better or higher Apprehensions of God's Holy Covenant, (the Grace whereof must bring them to Heaven if ever they come thither,) and of his so highly honoured Friends, *Abraham, Isaac,* and *Jacob*, with all the rest of the Holy Patriarchs, Prophets, and godly Believers of that Day ; than to call it a carnal Covenant, and them a carnal Church.

3. If *Abraham's* Covenant, was a Covenant of Works to him and his Children, then it must (needs) be so to us Gentile Believers, and to our Children now.

And if so, let the Adversary demonstrate (if he can) how *Abraham*, or any of that carnal Church (as they falsely term it) can be supposed, to be (now) in a saved State : Or, what Ground of Hope we Gentile Believers (and our Children) have,

have, that we or any of ours shall go to Heaven when we die, seeing that we are still under the very same Covenant with *Abraham*; which Covenant, if it be a Covenant of Works, and not of Grace, no Salvation can be expected; and if the Believers (under that dark Dispensation) were carnal, and not spiritual, how comes the unerring Wisdom of God to propound them to Believers under the Gospel, for Examples and Patterns of Faith, Patience, &c. *Heb. 11. Heb. 12. 1 Jam. 5. 10.* Let it be farther considered, that, albeit, the Seal of Circumcision sealed no saving Blessings to the Non-Elect; it doth not hence follow, that it sealed no other than Temporal Blessings to the Elect, seeing that (to them) the Heavenly were (Typically) included in the Earthly.

As touching the earthly Blessings, which Circumcision sealed to the Non-Elect, they were greater and better than God was (any way) obliged to give them. I am sure than they (savingly) improved.

Object. We utterly deny, that Water-Baptism did succeed and come in the room of Circumcision.

Ans. For Confirmation of the Affirmative, let the three Arguments already laid down under this Head, be seriously, and without Prejudice, considered: to which

I will only add the Explication of *Colos. 2. 11, 12.* whereon I have grounded a fourth Argument, to prove that Water-Baptism succeeded and came in the room of Circumcision. In the place above quoted, the Apostle plainly sets forth to the believing *Colossians*, (and in them to all believing *Gentiles*, to the World's End) two things, (necessary to be known and believed by all true Believers.)

First, That they, who, by a true lively Faith, have embrac'd the Lord Jesus Christ, (as held forth in the Gospel,) evidencing their Faith by the Truth of Gospel Sanctification: They, and none else, who are Adult, are made actual Partakers of the true and saving Circumcision, effected in the Soul by the Spirit of Christ. And which was (externally) signified by the outward Circumcision.

These Believers having (now) obtained the Spiritual Circumcision, are not at all to be concerned or Troubled, that they are not outwardly Circumcised with the Circumcision made with Man's Hands. Forasmuch as that which was (Externally) signified and sealed to the believing *Jews*, by the outward Circumcision, is (now Internally and Powerfully) wrought in their Hearts by the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Secondly

Secondly, The Apostle sets forth in this place, that Water-Baptism is instituted and appointed by Christ (under the Gospel Dispensation) to be (to believing *Gentiles*) the same that Circumcision was to the *Jews*, viz. A Visible Sign and Seal of *Abraham's* Covenant to all his Ecclesiastical Church-Seed among the *Gentiles*, viz. All of that Race, who (on God's calling them) believe in and obey the Lord Jesus Christ. To these and their Infant-Seed (and none else among the *Gentiles*) Baptism doth (now under the Gospel) signify and seal the very same spiritual Blessings and Church Privileges, which Circumcision (of old) did signify and seal to the believing *Jews* and their Infant-Seed.

This I take to be the Sense and Meaning of the Apostle, in that so much controverted place. In this Sense, I hope, I shall die satisfied. And herein, I humbly conceive, none of the Orthodox will differ from me; which Sense being granted, it is beyond the reach of all Scriptural Contradiction, that Water-Baptism was Instituted and appointed (by Christ) on purpose to succeed in the room of Circumcision.

CH A P. I V.

Shewing and proving that the Infants of Believing Gentiles (now under the Gospel) have as real a Right to the Covenant of Grace, and to Baptism, the (now) Visible Sign and Seal thereof: as had the Children of Abraham (according to the Flesh) to it, and to Circumcision, the then Seal of the Covenant of Grace.

And, that they are as capable of the Grace and outward Seal of the Covenant, as are the most Adult grown Believers.

I shall lay down Four Arguments, to evince and make good (against all Opposition) what I now assert.

Arg. 1. **T**H E first Argument is thus fram'd: If God (himself) did, by absolute Sovereign Grace, comprehend Abraham's Church-Seed in the Covenant of Grace he made with believing Abraham, (their Stipulating and Covenanting Father) and never since Repeal'd that Gracious Act of his: Then the Infants of Abraham's Church-Seed are still interested in the Covenant of Grace, and have as great Right to and are as capable of the Grace and Seal of that Covenant as ever.

But God (himself) did by absolute Sovereign Grace, comprehend Abraham's Church-

Church-Seed in the Covenant of Grace he made with believing *Abraham*, their Stipulating and Covenanting Father) which Gracious Act of his was never since Repealed.

Therefore the Infants of *Abraham's* Church-Seed are still interested in the Covenant of Grace, and have as great a Right to, and are as capable of the Grace and Seal of that Covenant as ever.

I cannot see how this Argument can possibly be overthrown, but by proving, that God did alter and change that Covenant he made with *Abraham* (his Friend) for himself and for his Church-Seed : The which, when the Adversary doth by Evidence of Scripture, (not abused and perverted,) I shall then yeild the Cause, and bewail my Mistake. But two things cause in me an unshaken Confidence, that this can never be done. *First*, The Immutability and Unchangeableness of God, on which very account he is stiled a Covenant-keeping God, who never yet cast off any poor Sinner, until that Sinner did first actually cast God off ; the which, I think, the Adversary dares not deny. *Secondly*, The Impossibility of poor Infants actually casting God off, and that because of their Incapacity in respect of Age.

Arg. 2. If Infants be at all saved, they are saved by the Grace of God's Covenant made with *Abraham*; which Covenant, and the External Seal thereof, (in the Visible Church) must belong to them also.

But Infants are saved by the Grace of God's Covenant, (made with *Abraham*) and in no other way.

Therefore the Covenant of God's Grace (by which they are saved) and the Seal thereof, (in the Visible Church) must belong to them also.

This Argument hath been constantly maintained (by the Orthodox) against the Enemies of Infant Baptism, with such Success, that I never yet heard the Man's Name, who was able to answer or overthrow the same by sound or solid Argument.

To deny Salvation to Infants is a Principle so monstrously cruel and uncharitable, (exposing to the Judgment of God, and to the deserved Frowns of all Tender-hearted Parents) that some, who account it a point of great Skill and Wisdom, (in the Mystery of the Gospel) to decry and witness against Infant Baptism, have declared themselves strongly inclin'd to believe, that all Infants are saved, and that without distinguishing between Elect and Reprobate, or between the Seed of Professing

felling Godly Believers, and that of *Maho-*
metans, &c. A Principle (altogether) as
 silly and groundless as that of denying the
 Right of Believers Infant-Seed to the Co-
 venant of Grace, and the Visible Token or
 Seal thereof in the Church. And at what
 Door this (Heterodox) Dream should en-
 ter, or from what Root or Principle it
 should spring, I know not, unless from that
 Popish Arminian Principle of general Re-
 demption and universal Grace. Here, by
 the Concession (or Grant) of the very Ad-
 versaries, Infants are saved ; but how, or
 in what way ? whether by a Covenant or
 without a Covenant. Here they are (pro-
 foundly) silent, not daring to mention any
 Covenant at all, fearing an Advantage may
 be (thereby) given to discover or prove
 the Right of Infants to the Covenant. It
 is sufficient (such Dreamers judge) to leave
 poor Infants to the general Mercy and
 Grace of God, as those do, who dream
 and conceit, that the very Damned in
 Hell shall, at length, be delivered from the
 Torments of that Place. For which Chy-
 merical Whym, there is as much to be
 said (from the Word of God,) as there
 is to prove, that God will extend the
 Grace of his Covenant to all Infants dy-
 ing so.

The Adversary I dispute against, knows very well, that should it be granted (*in Terminis*) in plain Terms, that Infants are loved by the Grace of the Covenant, it can no way be avoided, but that Infants must be in that Covenant, and must have an indisputable Right (*in foro Ecclesie*) to the outward Seal thereof.

But this must be denied, and its contrary asserted, (for the most glorious Gospel-Truth,) *viz.* That Believers only (excluding their Infants) are interested in the Covenant, and have a Right to the Seal thereof; and that in the Right of the Profession they make before Men.

Now, how absurd and contrary to the very Tenure and Design of God's Covenant with Christ (in the behalf of the Elect) this Principle of *Anabaptism* is; I leave to every unprejudic'd Reader (who understands any thing in Religion) to Judge. And whether to restrain the Promise of God's Covenant (which equally extends to all the Elect) to that part of the Elect, which are adult and grown up, to make a Profession, and to extend the Grace of God beyond the Bounds of his own Covenant, be not equally to raise the Foundation of Gospel-Truth, and to usurp the Throne of God (or to invade his Prerogative) in the Church; I leave to Wise Men to determine.

If

If thus to do falls not under that dreadful Commination (or Woe threatned) in *Rev. 22. 18.* I am greatly mistaken.

Arg. 3. If Infants do stand in as real need of the Grace of God's Covenant as the Adult do, and be (every way) as capable thereof as the Adult are, then must they of necessity be allow'd the Seal thereof in the Church.

But Infants do stand in as real need of the Grace of God's Covenant, and are (every way) as capable thereof as the Adult are.

Therefore the Seal of God's Covenant in the Church must of necessity be allow'd them.

That Infants are Partakers of *Adam's* Guilt, and also of that Pravity and Pollution of Nature, which came by *Adam's* Fall, I am confident will be deny'd by none (unless by downright Dreamers) now to own this.

And at the same time to teach and hold, that Infants are (because not grown up to the use of Reason and actual Faith) incapable of Regeneration, is to deny Salvation to all Infants, who die Infants : And how well this Principle accords with all Infants being saved, (who die Infants) is not difficult to understand. If this be not *Contradictio in Terminis*, viz. A Contradiction in plain Terms, I know not what a Contradiction means.

The Lord Christ (who can neither lye nor be deceived in what he saith) assures us, that *except one be born again, he cannot (possibly) see the Kingdom of God.* Joh. 3. 3. wherein the absolute need of Regeneration is discovered and asserted ; and the Subject of which, this is predicated (in that Text) being indefinitely and universally exprest ; we are taught that neither Adult nor Infant, shall ever enter Heaven, till that Work of Regeneration pass on the guilty polluted Soul : And to say that an Adult (or grown) Person (by reason of his Age) is capable of this great Change, but that an Infant (because he wants the use of reason, &c.) is incapable of it. What is this but (interpretatively) to hold and say, that the Creatures own Will and Reason must concur to the producing the New Creature in a Dead Soul.

And how advantageous this Principle is to *Papists, Arminians, Pelagians* and *Soci-nians* ; the Learned and Orthodox well know.

The Enemies themselves do (with us) acknowledge, that Water-Baptism is a Passive Ordinance : and strange it is, that those (of that Party) who are concerned to deck and adorn the Frontispiece of their Books (against Infant Baptism) with such Ornate Flourishes of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin

Latin Sentences, do not (in their way of arguing about this matter) give us to understand that they understand and know the Meaning and proper Signification of the Word Passive, better than it appears they do ; certain it is, and the Learned know it, that the Term Passive signifies and imports a Non-agency in the Subject, when a Change is passing on it, or a Work producing in it; to the effecting of which Change (or Work) the Subject recipient neither wills nor acts any thing towards the Production of such a Change.

If I understand any thing of God's Mind (revealed in the Sacred Scripture) or was ever (experimentally) acquainted with the Spirits Method in passing that great Change on a Sinner, in effectual Calling. The Work consists of two Parts. First, God's Gracious Acts, in freely pardoning all the Rebel's Sins and Transgressions committed against the Law, imputing to him that Spotless Righteousness of Christ his Son (the Sinners Sponsor or Surety) as truly and really as if that Spotless Righteousness had been acted and performed by the Sinner himself (personally.) This is the first part wherein that great Change lies or consists, which, in Divinity is called Justification.

The Second is, God's quickening and renewing the inward Powers and Faculties of

the Soul, by communicating a principle of Spiritual Life to the Sinner, in every of the Souls Faculties within: I do not mean (or intend) that in this Work of Regenerating the Sinner, the natural Faculties (concreated with the Nature of *Adam*) are destroyed or annihilated, but that the Predominancy of those vicious Qualities (inhering in the Souls Faculties) is overpowered by the Sanctification of the Spirit; and a contrary Principle of saving (and unloosable) Grace is communicated to every of these Faculties in the Soul, whereby the new Principle communicated, maintains its own Being in those respective Faculties, (and is through the continual supply of the Spirit which produced the Change) and making continual Resistance against that Vice and Corruption (as yet) remaining in the same Faculties where the new Creature is appointed to War and Combat, until that sinless Perfection (promised in the Covenant of Grace) supersede and dispossess that indwelling Corruption (in the Soul) under which the new Creature continues to groan, until a perfect Release come.

This is called Sanctification; and when the set time (prefixed in God's Decree) for calling an Elect Sinner, is come; what produceth this great Change?

I will

I will suppose the Sinner to be come to the Years of Manhood, capable of acting or exercising his natural Faculties ; doth his Will or his Reason help the Almighty in producing so miraculous a Change ? Can the Eye of this Sinners blind Reason (and understanding) see into or comprehend the hidden Mystery of that Wisdom manifested and set forth in that stupendious and astonishing Contrivance of God's justifying and reconciling to himself an Apostate, Rebel, Sinner, by the imputed Righteousness of another ? Can the Eye of blind Reason be capable of this ? Can the Will of this dead Sinner incline or move it self towards the Sinners own Conversion, to be a Coadjutor or Fellow-helper, to forward or help the Almighty in effecting this strange and miraculous Change ? Can it (possibly) be that Spiritual (or Corporal) Blindness can cure it self, or that Enmity and Rebellion can change its own Nature ?

Let the Experience of every (rightly) assured Believer speak to this.

If then nothing in the poor dead Sinner, neither the use of his natural Reason, nor yet any Activity in his unrenewed Will doth contribute any help to produce so wonderful a Change ; the Work must needs be (entirely) God's own Work. From which I argue in the behalf of poor Infants, if God

can

can, and doth freely pardon and blot out the Millions of actual Sins (added to the original Guilt) of an adult Sinner; if he can and doth freely and most graciously impute the Righteousness of his Son; and by thus doing, justifies an adult Sinner: If God can (and doth) by the irresistible Efficacy of his own holy Spirit, renew the Faculties of the Soul of an adult Sinner, which is (as I may say) steeped (and even soaked) in Vitiolity and actual Pollution; cannot the same Almighty, Just, Wise and Gracious God do and effect the like change in and upon a poor helpless Infant, though that Infant understand not what is done to it, neither is capable of contributing any Help towards so great a Change?

From what hath been (here) offered to Consideration, to me it is evident and plain, that when Men cry out and say, Infants (while Infants) are incapable of Regeneration, because they want the use of Reason, &c. they speak most injuriously and ignorantly against God himself, as if he could not (or would not) effect that in and for an Elect Infant which he doth for an adult Sinner; as the justifying and renewing an adult Sinner hath no Dependence on the Reason, Will or Speech of a grown Sinner, even so the Want of actual Reason, Activity of Will or Speech in an Infant, cannot possibly)

sibly) hinder God from effecting this great and gracious Work in and upon an Elect Infant, though the poor Infant can do nothing towards so great a Change. The Subject Recipient of this Work of Regeneration, is (every way) Passive, the Adult as well as the Infant.

Agreeable to this Act of God's in changing a Sinner, is that Ordinance of Water-Baptism, whose principal Use is twofold. First, to signify and represent his own gracious Dealing with the Sinner (Baptized) in Pardoning all his Sins, for Christ's sake ; whose Blood (represented by the Water in Baptism) was shed for the Remission of the Sins of all, comprehended in that Covenant of Grace, whereof Baptism is a Seal. And Secondly, that it may be a Seal to confirm to the Baptized (if Elect) all the gracious Promises of the same Covenant of Grace ; as God's Work (upon the Soul of a true Convert) is, in respect of the Sinner, wholly Passive ; so Baptism (the outward Sign and Seal of God's Covenant of Grace) is altogether Passive. And as the Wisdom of Christ saw fit to appoint the Element of material Water to be used in Baptism, as (above all the other Elements) most suited to the design of that Ordinance, because of the Analogy and Resemblance which is between Water and the Blood of Christ ; so no
Mode

Mode or Way of Administring this Water-Baptism doth so exactly and to the Life, set forth the Freeness of God's Grace and Mercy (exhibited) in the Covenant of Grace, then the Act of Sprinkling or Pouring out the Water on the Party Baptized. By this way of Sprinkling (under the Gospel) there is a sweet and orderly Harmony kept between the Pen-Men of God's Word, both under the Old and New Testament Dispensation, with whom, whoever studys to agree (in applying the Water of Holy Baptism) they will be at length found to be in the right, how many and black Censures soever are heapt on them by injudicious Spirits : The Spirit of God (in the Work of Regeneration) applys the Spiritual Baptism by Sprinkling or Pouring out of his Graces on the Soul. There must be an Analogie kept between the thing signified and the outward Sign.

Against what hath been laid down to prove Infants Right to Baptism, (the Seal of God's Covenant) many things are objected. I will, for Brevity sake, contract the Objections, with my Answers, to as few Particulars as possibly I can.

Object. 1. *In the Words of the Grand-Commission, there is not one Word concerning Infants, Mat. 28. 19. Go ye and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name, &c.*

This

This seems to weak (though well meaning) Minds to be unanswerable : But in the strength of him who gave out this Grand Commission, I hope to shew how wretchedly the Objector is mistaken herein.

In order whereto, let two things be seriously (and warily) considered.

First, That albeit Christ the Lord doth not mention Infants (in particular) yet he includes them in the Words of the general Commission, *Go Teach all Nations, Baptizing them, &c.* Here the Lord commands (expressly) that all such as belong to God's Covenant (with *Abraham*) *Gen. 7. 7.* shall be Baptized : namely, all who shall embrace the Son of God by Faith, and their Infant-Seed (if any they have). That this is the true sense and meaning of Christ in that place, is clear to any who do not (wilfully) shut their Eyes ; for evident it is, and none can deny, that he (there) commands to Baptize all Nations, not excepting against or forbidding the Disciples to baptize little Infants : He knew that he spake to Men, who (after the sending of the Holy Ghost) should know and consider that *Abraham's* Covenant (with Believers and their Infant-Seed) was to remain and continue the same to the end of the World. And this, (together with the sharp Rebuke he gave to his Apostles, for offering to hinder little Ones being

being brought to him ; and his laying before them such a convincing Reason wherefore such should not be kept from coming to him, *Mark* 10. 14. was the principal, (if not the only Reason) wherefore his infinite Wisdom saw it not needful to mention Infants in particular, they being (most certainly) included in the general term, all Nations : All Men (who know any thing of Learning) understand that *Omne majus continet in se minus*, (every greater includes or contains in it the lesser) is a sure and standing Rule both in Logick and Divinity.

Agreeing with this Sense (I have given off the grand Commission) is that of *Peter*, *Acts* 2. 39. *For the Promise is to you and to your Children*, &c. which affords an invincible Argument to prove that there is (now under the Gospel) no Change of *Abraham's* Covenant, (any other than in the external Administration of it) The Covenant (in its substance) abides the same for ever : By the Grace thereof all God's Elect (both of the Jewish and Gentile Race) are to be saved. *Rom.* 3. 29. What I have said will yet receive farther Confirmation by what is laid down by *Paul* in *Gal.* 3. 14. *That the Blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, through Jesus Christ*, &c. The Places now quoted out of *Acts* 2. 39. and *Gal.* 3. 14. presuppose a Command to all, (whether

(whether *Jew* or *Gentile*) who (by Faith) receives Jesus Christ for a Saviour) that they shall be signed with the Seal of *Abraham's* Covenant, according to *Gen. 17. 9*. For if the *Gentiles*, who believe in *Abraham's* Saviour, do expect that they and their Infants should be made actual Partakers of the Blessings of *Abraham's* Covenant; they must be sure to observe and keep God's Covenant with *Abraham* throughout their Generations.

Secondly, seeing that Christ (himself) words the Commission so in general terms, (which, undoubtedly, includes the particular) not excepting against Infants: It must necessarily follow, that if Infants be a part of those Nations which the Apostles, &c. are commanded to Baptize; that Christ commands them to Baptize Infants as well as any others. Reader, observe the Words of the Commission, *Go and Teach all Nations*, &c. Here is no more mention of grown Persons, Men or Women, than there is of Infants. If then *Anabaptists* cannot deny that Infants are a part of Nations, and that they can no way prove how *Abraham's* Blessing can come on the *Gentiles*, through Christ Jesus, any other way than by and through the Covenant of *Abraham*; It will (unavoidably) follow (all the Wit in Man cannot oppose it

it with Success) that Infants as well as adult Persons are (as the proper Subjects of Baptism) intended (by Christ) in the Grand Commission.

Object. 2. *None are the proper Subjects of Baptism, but such as are first taught, Go and Teach, &c. Infants are not capable of Man's Teaching, therefore they are not the proper Subjects of Baptism.*

Ans. This, with the Objection already spoken to, seems (to weak and injudicious People) to be unanswerable, (for excluding Infants from Baptism) but he that looks into it with a spiritual Eye, will find nothing in it against Infants.

In order to discover the Weakness and Mistake of the Objector, let it be observed (with Care) that the Word Teach, is twice mentioned in the Words of the Commission; *Go and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them, &c. And in Ver. 20. Teaching them to observe, &c.*

The first Teach, is (in the Original) *Mathetesate*; and the other is, *Didaskontes*; which I choose to set down in the *English* (rather than in the *Greek*) Character, to the end the unlearned may Read them; and in Reading, observe the great Difference which is between the two Words, and that both in the Letters and Sound of the Words; if this be taken Notice of, it will

will afford to the Unlearned (who would not be impos'd upon) ground to suspect, not only the Skill (in Tongues,) but also the Honesty and Faithfulness of those Guides, whom they judge come nearer to Infallibility in what they teach, than do the other eminent Servants of Christ, who differ from them; and at whose Labours the ablest Preachers of that Party, are glad to light their Candles.

As these two Words differ in Letters and Sound, as the Unlearned themselves will find, (if they be but Faithful to themselves,) so they differ also in their Sense and Signification, as the Orthodox and Learned well know. I begin with the first, *viz.* *Matheteusate*, which signifies (properly) to Disciple, or to make Disciples in all Nations; where the Gospel shall be (gladly) received.

How is this to be done? *Answ.* Even as God taught *Abraham*, when he Instructed him in the great Mystery of the Covenant: The which, when *Abraham* embrac'd for himself and his Infant-Seed, he receiv'd (gladly) the Visible Token or Seal of that Covenant of Grace, *viz.* Circumcision, and marks out his Infant-Seed, by putting the same Seal of the Covenant on them, and that in compliance with God's Command.

It is but rational to suppose and grant, that the first Subjects of an Ordinance should be Persons Adult and grown up to the use of Reason, that they may be capable of acting for not only themselves, but for their Off-spring and Posterity also, who are not (while Infants) capable of acting for themselves.

This was God's Way and Method with *Abraham* (his Friend) he propounds his Covenant of Grace to him, and (in him) to his Seed, as their stipulating and covenanting Head and Representative. In instructing *Abraham*, God, in *Abraham's* Person, instructs his Infants, so as by that Instruction his Infant Seed became Disciples, and were (accordingly) sign'd with the Seal of their stipulating Father's Covenant.

This, undoubtedly, was the Method which the Apostles went in, when they were sent forth to make Disciples (to Christ) in every Nation. They instructed Adult and Grown Persons in the Mystery of God's Grace (by Christ ; and when such laid hold on Christ (in the Covenant) by an External Profession of Faith, in him) they were Baptized with their Infants, (if any they had.) Hence we read of the Jailor in *Acts* 16. 33. who, on his Believing, was Baptized, he and all that were of him.

viz.

viz. His own Personal Off-spring, so the Greek Word signifies. Hence also we read of whole Families, who were Baptized (by the Apostles) on the Faith of such as were the Heads of such Families. It was no more necessary, that Infants should be made mention of, (as being in such Families when Baptized) than it was, that they should be nam'd in the grand Commission; the Spirit which gave out the Grand Commission, was in, and with the Apostles, when they Baptized; and it is, to me, convincing, that Infants are intended in both, seeing they are excepted against in neither, which the Adversary must (needs) be convinc'd of, unless he be able to prove, that Infants are neither a part of Nations or of Families.

The other Word teach, in the Commission is, *Didaskontes*, which (properly) signifies a Teaching or Instructing (Doctrinally) those who are already made Disciples by the former way of Teaching. Neither can it, without Lying, be said to be Nonsense and Folly, to term Infants (who are by the first Teaching made Disciples) Scholars or Disciples, seeing, that Infants (in Age) are (by the Spirit of Truth) so styl'd, witness *Acts 15. 10.* where such are called Disciples, who were made so by the Initiating Ordinance of Circumcision, who

who afterwards (when grown up) were taught (Doctrinally) what they were to know and practise; neither is this (any whit) repugnant to the Method God took with *Abraham*, but rather agreeing with it; as appears by *Gen. 18. 19.* and even among Men nothing more common and frequent, than to call our little Children Scholars or Disciples, and that from the very first Day of their being entred into a School: And as in Mens Schools there are sundry Ranks or Classes of Scholars, some lower and some higher; so in the School of Christ (the great Prophet of his Church) there are several Ranks or Degrees of Church Members. It is well known how ignorant (in the Mysteries of the Gospel) the very Apostles themselves were, when they first entred into Christ's School; yet Christ calls them his Disciples for all that. The Apostle *Paul* could not write or speak unto the *Corinthians*, but as unto Babes, as unto Carnal Men; yet they were Church Members for all that. These things duly considered, forces me to conclude those Men profoundly ignorant in the Mystery of God's Holy Covenant; who (because Infants are incapable of being taught and instructed (Doctrinally) as adult and grown Men are) peremptorily deny that Infants are capable of being made Disciples (to Christ)

Christ) by the Ministry of Men. This Principle came, no doubt, from the same Spirit which teaches that Infants, while Infants, are incapable of Regeneration; which are both (manifestly) false, because contrary to God's revealed Will.

Object. 3. *Baptism is a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, to which none have a right, but he or she who is a real true Believer.*

Ans. I answer in three Particulars. *First*, If Baptism be a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, then must it needs succeed and come in the room of Circumcision: And so the Truth is (here) granted, which elsewhere is denied, that Circumcision is a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith; is most plain from *Rom. 4. 11*. Now if Baptism be a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, (as the Objector grants, and as I believe and affirm it is) then Baptism did (undeniably) come in the room of Circumcision, that the same might be to believing *Gentiles* (under the Gospel) what Circumcision was, of Old, to *Abraham*, viz. a Seal of the Covenant of Grace.

Secondly, If none but actual Believers have a Right to that Righteousness of which Baptism is a Seal, then must it follow (unavoidably) that all Infants, who die in Infancy, are eternally lost: And how cruel this Doctrine is, and how inconsistent with

the Doctrine which teacheth that all Infants, dying Infants, are saved, all Men may see.

Thirdly, If none but real true Believers have a Right to Baptism, I would gladly see how those, I dispute against, can justify their own Practices, in admitting so many poor ignorant Folk to that Ordinance (in their way) who (with some who admit them) are as ignorant of the Mystery of Regeneration and of Baptism, (the external Seal thereof) as was *Nicodemus*. Can they, without a Divine Revelation, know that those whom they admit to Baptism are (infallibly) real true Believers?

Object. 4. *To apply Baptism, (the Seal of the Covenant) to an unintelligent Subject, who neither knows what is done to him, nor yields consent thereto: It is all one as to present a Picture to a blind Man, which to do, is most absurd and ridiculous.*

Answer. To this I shall reply in four Particulars. And *First*, I say, with a Learned Man, this is, at best, but a blind Comparison; and (which is far worse) a high and fancy Reflection on the infinite Wisdom and uncontrollable Sovereignty of the most high God; for most certain it is, that nothing can be offered as an Argument to keep Infants from Baptism, (meerly) on the account of their being unintelligent Subjects.

jects, and incapable of yeilding their Consent to what is done to them in Baptism). But what will be of as great force to keep them back from Circumcision? And so the Objector may see plainly how (herein) he arraigns the Wisdom and Sovereignty of God at the Barr of a shallow and corrupt Creature's Reason, which demonstrates him to be more Brutish (I am sure more proud and Wicked) than those Non-intelligent Subjects which the Objection is levelled against.

This will appear by considering God's dealing with *Abraham*, in that he commanded him to Mark, or Seal, his Son *Isaac* with the Seal of Circumcision at Eight Days old. Had *Isaac* the use of Reason at that Age? Had he actual Faith or Speech to express his Consent to what was (then) done to him? No sure; what then must God be charged with Weakness or Unreasonableness for applying the Seal of his Covenant to an unintelligent Subject? By these kind of Objectors, God's Act (herein) stands charged with Weakness and Folly; But I conclude with *Paul*, Rom. 3. 4. *Yea, let God be true, but every Man a Lyar.* God commands nothing in vain, and the reason is because his Ordinance hath no kind of dependence on the Creature, to give it Power, or to make it effectual to accomplish what he

hath appointed it to, but on his own free Spirit, which works most powerfully, yea, irresistably, where he himself hath purposed to confer the Spiritual Good, signified by the outward Ordinance.

Object. 5. The Promise of God's Covenant is made to the Elect, and none but they have a Right to the Seal: No Man can affirm that an Infant brought to Baptism is Elect.

Ans. I answer to this in two things. First, I grant that none shall ever reap any saving Benefit by the Covenant, but the Elect; (and that in the Right of Election) yet doth it not hence follow, that none but they have a Right to the Seal of the Covenant in the Church Visible, seeing that by the very Constitution of God's Covenant (with Abraham the Ecclesiastical Father, and Publick Visible Head of all the Seed of Believing Church-Members) God commands that the Seal of his Covenant shall be equally apply'd to all the Male Seed of the Believer; and that without any Regard to the Election, which is a Secret known (only) to God; about which he would not have us to trouble our Spirits, any farther than to give all (becoming) Diligence to make our own (Personal) Election sure to our selves. As touching the Infants of Church Members, about whom all the Dispute is, We are not (anxiously) to be concerned about

bout them, whether they be in the Election of God, yea or no. It is ground sufficient for us to bless and thank God for his dealing so graciously with our Infants, in that they, with us, are taken into the same Covenant, and Sealed with the Seal thereof; for by God's dealing thus with Believers Infant Seed, Believers have a good Foundation laid, whereon to bottom their Hope and Comfort, (with Reference to their Dying or Deceased Infants) and also of wrestling with God in Prayer for their Conversion and Eternal Welfare; the which the Enemies to Infant-Baptism, do (by denying that Infants belong to the Covenant, or have any Right to the Promises thereof, till they themselves believe) deprive, and (insensibly) spoil themselves of. This is most evidently true, as will appear if it be seriously considered, that all right Prayer is a Pleading the Promises of God's Covenant, in the Name and Merit of Christ his own Son, in and through whom, the said Promises are intail'd on all the Children of Promise: Now if my Infant be sick or ailing, if he be going on in Sin, &c. how can I (by the Anabaptist Principle) put up a Prayer to God for him, seeing there is no Promise of God's Covenant belongs to him? Or how can I comfort my sorrowful Spirit (with reference to my

Deceased Children) if I must look on my dear Babes as Strangers and Enemies to God, (the which they are by Nature ; and must remain so for ever) in case they be not Partakers of the Grace of God's Covenant ?

Secondly, If none but the Elect have Right to Baptism, this Objection will fall like a Mill-stone on them who Baptize whole Drovers of Men and Women ; of whose Election (to eternal Life) neither Baptizer nor Baptized, know any more than they know how many Stars in the Firmament ; so that by thus arguing against poor Tongue-ty'd Infants, they may see how they deny Salvation to their own, as well as others, Infants, and render themselves incapable of discharging a good Conscience to their poor Children, in putting up (daily) Petitions to God for them.

Object. 6. *We have an open Profession from those we Baptize, and that warrants our Baptizing such as offer themselves to join to the Churches. You have not the like from Infants.*

Answ. I answer hereto in three Particulars. *First*, It were well for both Baptizers and Baptized, if both the one and the other were better acquainted with the Nature of right Conversion than they are, and that they were better grounded in the sound (and experimental) Knowledge of the Covenant of Grace ; the which, if they were,

I dare (boldly) say, they would not be so precipitant and rash in condemning and despising those poor Infants, who are set forth (by the Wisdom of God) as Patterns and Examples, by which grown Persons are to be moulded and fitted for Heaven : Neither would they be so forward to offer themselves to Baptism on such slight and evanid Motions, as falls short (in too many) of common Convictions.

Secondly, Poor Infants never (yet) broke or transgressed the Moral Law, (Personally) and that is one great Reason why an actual Confession of Faith and Repentance is not required of them, to qualify them for Baptism : As the Sin of Infants lies in the Imputation of *Adam's* Disobedience, and the Pollution of Nature, derived by fleshly Generation ; so their Help and Remedy lies in the Imputation of Christ's Spotless Righteousness to their Persons ; and his Spirits renewing their inward Faculties in Regenerating them. And this twofold Work of the Spirit in justifying and sanctifying the Elect Infant, is (plainly) signified and sealed in that Ordinance of Baptism, to the Infant, as well as to a grown Believer.

Thirdly, Albeit Infants be not able to speak for themselves, and to claim that Right to the Seal of God's Covenant which the Covenant it self hath entail'd on them,

(as they are the Church Seed of Believing Parents) yet there is one who speaks for them, whose Judgment and Testimony of them is more sure and infallible than all other Testimonies of Men and Angels; the Lord Jesus, I mean, who (with his Father, and God the Holy Ghost) contrived and made the Covenant of Grace, wherein they are comprehended. I will lay down in six Particulars what is the Judgment of Christ concerning Infants, (as they are concerned in the Covenant) *First*, he propounds them as Patterns, by which grown Persons must be moulded and fitted for Heaven, *Mat. 18. 3.* *Secondly*, declares their Right to the Kingdom of God, *Mar. 10. 14.* *For of such is the Kingdom of God.* *Thirdly*, rebukes (most severely) his Disciples for hindering Infants being brought to him, *Mark 10. 14.* *But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, &c.* In the Greek it is *Eganakre, e*, which signifies to have the Bowels (inwardly) moved, or affected with Grief, to be filled with Indignation; as *Beza* renders it, *Indignatus est*, to be Stomackt at a Person, or a thing which is greatly or highly displeasing: A Word which judicious *Sydenham* observes, was never used by Christ in any case, or on any occasion, besides this of poor Infants, to instruct and teach Men: (No doubt) how greatly he

was

was concerned for helpless Infants, and how displeased he was at the Hardness of his Disciples Hearts against them : Oh ! that the Consideration of this might melt the hard Hearts of such, into a Christ-like Tenderneſs towards poor Infants. *Fourthly*, commands Infants to be brought to him, *Mark 10. 14. Suffer little Children to come unto me, &c.* *Fifthly*, pronounces them holy, *Rom. 11. 16. 1 Cor. 7. 14.* *Sixthly*, bleſſeth them, *Mark 10. 16. And he took them up in his Arms, laid his Hands upon them, and Bleſſed them.* Theſe Six Particulars laid together, and weighed in the Ballance of God's Sanctuary, I leave it to any Man of Senſe (in Spiritual Matters) to judge whether is ſafer to credit this Infallible Teſtimony of the Son of God, concerning Infants, than to rely on the bare Teſtimony of a meer Man, concerning himſelf ; who may, in all he pretends to, be but a Painted Sepulchre.

Object. 7. *If Infants muſt needs have a Right to Baptiſm, becauſe it is a Seal of the Covenant, then, of neceſſity, they muſt have a Right to the Lord's Supper alſo ; for that is a Seal of the Covenant of Grace as well as Baptiſm. The Wine in the Supper might as well be poured down the Infants Mouth with a Spoon, as to ſprinkle Water on his Face.*

Anſw. This Objection better becomes

a Superannuated Man, who borders on perfect Dotage, than one who pretends to be a Teacher of ignorant and misguided Souls; and not only so, but who takes on him to usurp the Seat of Judgment, in passing Sentence on all the Holy, Learned and Orthodox Divines, and Protestant Martyrs and Churches, who are gone to glory in the unshaken Belief that the Infants of Believing Parents have an unquestionable Right to Baptism, and that they are as capable of the Seal of Baptism as they are of the Grace of God's Covenant, signified thereby.

But that the Lord's-Supper belongs to none but to adult and actual Believers, who are capable of those Qualifications required in a worthy Communicant; such as Self-Examination (with Reference to his State God-ward) his Faith in Christ, his Progress in a Holy Life, his discerning the Lord's Body, his keeping up a lively Communion with Father, Son and Spirit in that Ordinance, and judging ones self in case of short coming in holy Duties.

These are the Qualifications required to be in one who comes to the Lord's Supper; of which, any (not in a Dream) may judge an Infant cannot be capable, (while an Infant) I humbly hope no judicious Christian will censure me, as rash and uncharitable; if I judge those Preachers fitter for a Shop-board

board than a Pulpit, who are not able or willing to discern or distinguish between Milk and strong Meat ; and who will deny to Infants the Milk of Holy Baptism, (whereof they are capable, and whereto (by God's Covenant) they have right, because they are incapable of receiving and digesting the strong Meat of the Lord's Supper.

Object. 8. If Infant-Baptism were God's Ordinance, and were accompanied with his Blessing, to the Infant, how comes it to pass, that so many Baptized, (in Infancy) prove so Carnal and Loose in their Lives and Conversations?

Ans. Hereto I reply in three Particulars, wherewith I shall shut up the present Dispute.

First, It is with many Believers Infants now (under the Gospel) as it was with *Abraham* and his Infants of old. Some are their Children by fleshly Generation only, who (*Ishmael-like*) prove Mockers and Scoffers at Holiness, and Haters of God and good Men : These, (notwithstanding the Relation they stand in to the Church, by Virtue of their Baptismal Vow and the External Profession they make in the Visible Church for a time) being left to the Darkness and Folly lodged in their corrupted Nature, they give themselves over

to all kind of Looseness. Baptism (now) is no more to be faulted on this account, than Circumcision was formerly.

When the Children of believing *Gentiles* do (actually) violate God's Covenant, and depart from him; then will God do with them, as he did with *Abraham's* Carnal Seed, &c.

Secondly, As some of the Children of believing Parents, who were Baptiz'd in Infant State, prove loose and vain, so blessed be God, a great many prove holy and upright Walkers with God, manifesting in their Lives and Conversations, the lively Copy of that Spiritual Circumcision wrought (by the Spirit) in their Hearts when Converted, which was signified and sealed by that Baptism, which they were made Partakers of when Infants.

Thirdly and lastly, If from the vain and sinful Practice of some (Baptized in Infancy) Infant-Baptism must be disallow'd, (as no Institution of God) how strong an Argument will this prove, to overthrow the Baptizing grown Professors? For (if I mistake not) the Opposers of Infant-Baptism must own, (will they nill they) that many of those Baptized (in their way) have (notwithstanding their shining Profession, and their high Pretensions to the Work of the Spirit within) fallen most foully, and never recover'd again. And

And thus I have, according to the Wisdom given from above, endeavoured to clear up, (from God's Word) that *Abraham's Covenant*, *Gen 17. 7.* is (most certainly) the Covenant of Grace. I have also prov'd (from the same Word) that Circumcision was the Seal of that Covenant: And that Baptism (under the Gospel) is now succeeded (or come in the room) thereof. I have endeavoured to prove, that the Infants of believing *Gentiles* have as real a Right to Baptism as *Abraham's Seed* had to Circumcision, under that dark Dispensation. And whether the Answers I have given to the most material Objections, I find brought against Infant-Baptism, be pertinent and convincing, I leave to the judicious and unprejudic'd to judge.

C H A P. V.

Of Immersion. Proving that Gospel-Baptism is by Sprinkling, not by Dipping.

AMong all the Rash and Presumptuous Assertors of Dipping the whole Body under Water, being the only right Mode or Manner of Baptizing, none hath made a greater Noise (or a fairer shew) of being (herein) infallible, than one *William Russel*, who

who styles himself *Medicinae Doctor Academia Cantabrigiensis*.

This Author, with a more than ordinary Confidence, hath boldly asserted, that Dipping, &c. is the only right Mode of Baptizing, commanded by Christ in the *New-Testament*, and practised by *John* the Baptist, and all the Apostles and Primitive Christians.

This crude (or raw) Assertion of his, he labours to support and make good by a fourfold *Medium*: *First*, The *Etymologie* of the *Greek* Word the Holy Ghost useth to express Dipping by.

Secondly, Those Metaphors used in Holy Scriptures, to represent it to our Understanding.

Thirdly, The Practice of the first Baptizers.

Fourthly, The Words of the Grand Commission given by our Saviour in *Mat.* 28. 19.

To demonstrate the Falseness of his Assertion, and to discover to Weak and Injudicious People, the great Mistakes whereon he bottoms his Assertion, is the Design of my present Undertaking. But before I attack this *Goliath*, in examining what he can get from the four Particulars (above mentioned,) which may cause simple and empty Brains to think and conceit this

Accademical Doctor, invincible and unanswerable in what he hath (so peremptorily) asserted for the Truth of God. I will lay down two things, (by way of Premise) whereof I desire the Reader (who is unwilling to be deceiv'd) to take Notice.

The first is, That not so much the bare Letter of Scripture, as the Sense and Meaning of the Spirit, (therein) is the Word of God ; by which Truth and Error are to be try'd and judg'd. I have often said, (and I am very bold in affirming that) that Sense or Interpretation, which any Man or Men give of any Text of God's Word, which thwarts and contradicts the Analogie of Faith, that Sense or Interpretation is from the Spirit of Satan, not from God, be the same never so plausible and pleasing to the Sons of Men ; and be the Authors never so highly esteem'd of, for both their Piety and Learning. There is a sweet and an harmonious Concord and Agreement between all the parts of God's Revealed Religion, though but few (comparatively) can see it to be so. The Doctrine and Institutions of God in all the particulars of his instituted Worship, are plain, easie, and obvious to the Eye, which the Spirit of Christ hath anointed. But to such Men and Women, who are Destitute of the Spirit of Christ, nothing in Religion

Religion appears to them, but Nonsense and seeming Contradictions, which is the Reason why so many thousands in *England* &c. stagger and reel (with a Spiritual *Vertigo*) in the Principles of the Protestant Religion, wherein both they and their Ancestors were Initiated (by Water-Baptism;) and in maintaining of which, they seemed (for many years) very Zealous.

The second thing I shall premise, is this, (*viz.*) That Heterodox and Corrupt Underminers of the Gospel are then to be most of all lookt after and watcht against, when they lay about them, to advance the Fame and Credit of the Devil's Ministers, by Eclipsing and Darkening the Credit and deserved Fame of Christ's Worthys, whom Christ hath honoured with, being the chief Combatants in the Lord's Battels against the Powers of Darkness in this World.

My Design in this, is to discover to the unwary Reader, this Doctor's Design of blackening that Renowned and Incomparable Servant of Christ, Mr. *John Calvin*, than whom, I verily believe, the World hath not (since the Apostles left the Earth) seen a greater Divine. A Man, who (for his high and excellent Endowments in all manner of Learning, especially his Eagle-eyedness)

eyedness, in penetrating into the Sense of Scriptures) was more like a Prophet, or an Apostle, than an ordinary Preacher.

This Doctor, that he might put a Lustre on *Michael Servetus* his Name, draws the Pencil of horrid and black Reproach across the Name and Reputation of Holy and (as I said) incomparable *Calvin*. The Devil (in his Ministers) being deeply sensible how the famous and elaborate Works of that one Man stand in the way, to prevent and hinder the Devil growing Rampant, in advancing his Kingdom of Darkness among the Sons of Men.

Calvin is (by the Dr.) represented as an ambitious, Self seeking Man; and (which is far worse) a bloody Persecutor, while his *Servetus* is deckt and adorned with the Robes of a glorious Martyrdom. The Drs. Words will shew whether I be mistaken in what I say of him, see *Page 4* of the Drs. Epistle, where he saith, (with a Spirit of Virulency) and at last I concluded it must certainly proceed from the very Spirit and Principle of the first founder of your Sect, (meaning the *Presbyterians*) Master *John Calvin*, who burnt the Books of *Servetus*, a Learned Baptist, and afterwards perswaded the Magistrates of *Geneva* to burn him alive; which Sentence was executed upon him, (as *Castellio* testifies, who was a

con-

contemporary with him) In these Words *Michael Servetus* was burnt alive for his Opinion at *Geneva*, 1553, upon the 27th Day of *October*.

Besides this, the Dr. tells his Reader, (with an ungodly Design, to lessen and blacken the Famous *Calvin*, and to extol his *Servetus*,) that one well observes, that Mr. *Calvin* did acknowledge of *Servetus*, that he was a Learned Charitable Man; notwithstanding which, he wrote a Book to justify *Servetus* being put to Death.

When I see and read these things, from a better and more impartial Testimony than *Castellio* was, I shall then say somewhat to it. But (indeed) I must ingeniously assure the Dr. that I shall neither believe him, nor his *Castellio*, in the Reports they spread abroad of *Calvin*, and others (of Christ's Worthys) who detect and decry their Heretical Doctrines.

Not him, because sad Experience teaches, that those of his Judgment are pretty well skilled in Misrepresenting and Belying the most Holy, Orthodox, and most Learned of Divines; on purpose to gain Ground among the less intelligent, whom they know to be strangers to Authors; and who will be easily drawn to credit those Reports, which they are not able to contradict: especially when represented

sented to them, by the Mouth and Pen of such as they take to be good Men.

Not his *Castellio*, because I look on him every way as unfit to be a Witness, against so Orthodox and great a Propugnator of Gospel Verities, as *Calvin* is known to be; And that, on the Account of the Testimonies given of *Castellio*; by good and learned Men, who better knew what *Castellio* was than Dr. *Russel* doth.

The Great and Learned *Scaliger* charges *Castellio* with holding many corrupt Opinions of the *Anabaptists*.

And the Learned *Hoffman* accused him for being one of the first Sowers of the Seed of *Arminianism*.

Tar. Faber, another Great and Learned Author, charged him with saying that the Song of *Solomon* was a Wicked Book. And he held that *Paul* taught a more Mysterious Divinity to some perfect Disciples, than he left in Writing, this is to be seen in his Book, on the First Epistle to the *Corinthians*.

Now, if the impartial Reader seriously weighs the Account given of *Calvin* and *Castellio*, by the Orthodox and Learned, he will soon conclude with me, That had the Parts and Learning of *Servetus* and *Castellio* both concenter'd in one Head, *Calvin's* Orthodoxy in the Faith, and his Excellency

Excellency in all manner of Learning, had never been in Danger of Suffering an Eclipse : Nor yet his Books of receiving a solid Answer (much less a Confutation) by such Men as *Servetus* and *Castellio*; whatever *Dr. Russell* and his bigotted Profelytes think or believe to the contrary.

That Eagle-eyed *Calvin* soared too high (in penetrating into the *Arcana Imperii* of Heaven) for such Glow-Worms to reach his Sense, or to understand the Spirit by which he speaks and Writes. *Wisdom is justified of none but her own Legitimate Offspring*, Mat. 11. 19.

And here I desire the wary Reader to take notice of the fraudulent Design of *Dr. Russel*, which is, to impose on his Reader, a believing that *Servetus* (who dy'd at *Geneva* for his Opinion) did die for being an Anabaptist: which indeed is a notorious Piece of Falshood, as the Learned and Godly (who look into Antiquity) well know, who give that Account of *Servetus*, that he was Executed at *Geneva* for his Blasphemy against the Holy Trinity, he denying the God-Head of Christ, and the Personality of the Holy Ghost.

This the *Dr.* well knew would have spoiled his Design, had he (honestly) told his Reader what an Heterodox and Blasphemous Wretch, his *Servetus*, that Learned Baptist

Baptist (who died at *Geneva* for his Opinion) was.

And truly, (to be plain) had *Servetus* dy'd for being an Anabaptist (which I utterly deny he did,) yet, I am far from thinking the better of Anabaptism therefore : Or judging *Servetus*, (or any others who on that Account lose their Lives) to be true Martyrs of Jesus.

That Saying of *Cyprian* will ever be true, that *Causa, non Mors, facit Martirem*: The Cause, not Death, makes a Martyr. As the Blessed Jesus hath his Witnesses, who Seal the Word of his Patience, with their dearest Blood.

So the Devil hath his Witnesses, (yea, many more than Christ hath) who Seal their Infernal Heresies, and Damnable Doctrines, with their Hearts Blood ; yet I am far from believing that such Martyrs, will ever be owned by Christ, at their going off the Stage : Or that such Sufferings will make better the horrid Lies and Blasphemies Men suffer for, be their Constancy, seeming Zeal, and Courage what it will.

Having premised these things, I now proceed to examine the Four Particulars, whereon his Fabrick of Anabaptism seems to be Founded.

The Dr. and (with him all Anabaptists) hold, and (with great Confidence) assert: that Dipping and Plunging the whole Body under Water, is the only right manner of Baptism, which all Believers are to practise under the Gospel.

This he labours, (though in vain) to make good by the Etymologie of the Word, which the Spirit uses to express Baptism by.

The Word (in the Greek (is βαπτίζω, which, saith the Dr. is derived from βάπτω to Dip or Plunge a thing under Water. This Signification of the Primitive Word βαπτίζω, he confirms by Humane Testimony; he begins with Learned Mr. Leigh, to whose *Critica Sacra* he refers his Reader, in quoting whom, he deals with his Reader as he did in quoting *Servetus*; he saith, that *Servetus* dy'd at Geneva for his Opinion, but hides from his Reader the horrid Blasphemies for which he died: So here the Doctor (designedly) curtails the Observations of Mr Leigh on the Word βαπτίζω, telling his Reader so much out of Mr. Leigh as he thinks makes for his Cause, but leaving out what of Mr. Leigh he knows makes full against him; which (I must needs say) is the Trick of a Deceiver: And by these kind of Shifts he, and the most Crafty of his Party, do endeavour to underprop their sinking Cause,

Cause, bearing poor simple Folk in hand, that the Eminently Learned and godly Men (whom they Quote) were of the Anabaptists Perswasion.

Now to let his Unfairness appear herein, I here set down what of *Leigh* he quotes, and what of him he omits.

The Word βαπτίζω saith Mr. *Leigh*, is derived from the Word βάπτω, *Tingo*, to Dip or Plunge into the Water; and signifieth (primarily) such a kind of Washing as is used in Bucks, where Linnen is plunged and dipt. Thus far the Dr. quotes *Leigh*, and who would not think by reading so much of *Leigh*, and looking no further, (as the Dr. no doubt would have his Reader) but that *Leigh* in his *Critica Sacra* was of the Drs. Judgment herein.

Now follows the Learned *Leighs* Observations on the Signification of the Word βαπτίζω, yet, saith he, it is taken more largely (meaning *Baptizo*) for any kind of washing, rinsing or cleansing, even where there is no Dipping at all; for which he quotes *Mat. 3. 11. I indeed Baptize you with Water, &c. Mat. 20. 22. Are ye able to be Baptized with, &c. Mark 7. 4. And when they come from the Market, except they wash they eat not. Luke 3. 16. Acts 1. 5. Acts 11. 16. and 1 Cor. 10. 2. In all which Scriptures Mr. Leigh doth acknowledge*

ledge that βαπτίζω (the Derivative) is of a larger Signification then βάπτω its Primitivē, and intends such a washing as is done without Dipping ; and why should this be conceal'd from the Reader ?

As for Zeppeorus, Alstedius, Plutarch and Nazianzen, (on whom the Dr. lays no small stress) I hope he will allow us the same Liberty he takes to himself, (viz.) to quote such Testimonies as make for us.

The Learned Dr. Featly (quoted by Mr. Leigh) tells us, that Christ no where requireth Dipping, but only Baptizing ; which Word (saith he) Hesychius, Stephanus, Scapula and Budens, the great Masters of the Greek Tongue) make good by very many Instances and Allegations out of Clasick Writers, that the Word importeth no more than Ablution or Washing βαπτίζω (say they) in their Lexicons and Commentaries) *Lavo, Βάπτισμα Lavatio, Ablution*, which may be done without Dipping.

As touching the Greek Lexicon, Publish'd and Recommended by,

Joseph Caryl,	}	Matthew Barker,
George Cokayne,		William Adderly,
Ralph Venning,		Matthew Mead,
William Dell,		Henry Jessey.

All that I shall (or need to) say, is this, viz. that albeit I own my self bound to Reverence and Honour the hoary Head, when found in the Way of Truth and Righteousness, yet it must still be with the Reservation of the Honour and Respect which I owe to God, (that Ancient of days) their Father and mine, who alone and not the Learning and Wisdom of Men (though the greatest and holiest) is the Father of their Faith and mine. I am not insensible that some Learned and good Men have granted, that the Word βαπτίζω doth indifferently signifie, any kind of Washing by pouring out or sprinkling Water upon, or by dipping or plunging into the Water; and this they have grounded on the native Signification of the Primitive Word βαπτω. But with becoming Modesty and due Veneration to their Reverend Names, I must crave leave in telling the World, that for a World I cannot be of their Opinion (herein) until I receive greater and clearer light from the Spirit and Word of God, concerning this Matter; and that for the Reasons here following. First, the apparent difference I find between the two Words, βαπτω and βαπτίζω in Letters and Syllables, let the Words be observed in βαπτω (the Primitive) I can find but 2 Syllables, *βαπ-τω* *απο*, but in the Derivative, βαπτίζω I find

E

three,

three, Βαπ-π-ζω, *Baptizo*; and as in the Active, (so also in the Passive) Voice, Βαπτω-μαι, *Bap-to-mai* hath three Syllables, whereas Βαπ-τι-ζο-μαι which is the Passive of Βαπ-π-ζω, hath four Syllables, Βαπ-τι-ζο-μαι *Bap-ti-zo-mai*. Now that the 2 Words should both in Active and Passive Voice so apparently differ in Letters, Syllables, and sound of the Words; and yet that both the Words should signifie and import the very same thing, is to me such a Riddle, that indeed I cannot see how the same can be unfolded, unless by the elucidating Art and Skill of Dr. *Russel*. The Learned know (very well) that in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Tongues, the Change of a Letter or a Syllable doth greatly alter the Sense and Import of Words; and why it should not be so here, I cannot see any solid Reason to the contrary, only it is the Will and Pleasure of our Dr. (and his Adherents in this Cause) that it must and shall be so, right or wrong; as appears by his Arminian Confidence almost in every Page where he mentions the Word *Baptize*; where he (peremptorily) begs the Question, taking for granted, that which will never be granted by any, (unless by Brainless Heads or wilful Underminers of the Gospel, (*viz.*) that the Derivative Βαππ-ζω doth always (in the Gospel) signifie and import the very same thing with *Bapt*

viz. to Dip or Plunge the whole Body under Water.

But that which will farther clear the matter, and put the Truth (I here contend for) out of the reach of all Scriptural Contradiction, is the Practice of the Holy Ghost, who is a better Etymologist than our Dr. and then all the Arminian (and other Heretical) Criticks, who (in pretence of giving the Native and Genuine Sense of Words in the Scripture) have forc't a wrong Sense from the Original, on purpose to lay a firm Foundation, on which they may build their Heterodox, and Soul deluding Doctrines.

I find that when the Holy Ghost would express the Act of Dipping or Plunging into, he doth it only by the Primitive *Βάπτω*, never by the Derivative *Βαπτίζω* that I can find: For Proof whereof, let those Scriptures (quoted by the Dr. himself in Page 11.) be without prejudice lookt into, and seriously weighed, *Rev. 19. 13 He had his Vesture dipt in Blood. Mat. 26. 23. He that lippeth his Hand with me in the Dish. Luke 6. 24. That he may dip the tip of his Finger in Water. And in John 13. 26. it is (saith the Dr.) twice used, Βάπτας Dipped ὑψήσας, and when he had Dipped: Here in these Places the Holy Ghost expresseth the Act Dip or Plunge into by the Primitive*

Βάπτω, but never by *Βαπτίζω*, *Baptizo*, the Derivative.

Secondly, again (on the contrary) when the Holy Ghost expresseth Baptism by washing, he doth it by the Derivative *βαπτίζω*, but never by the Primitive *βάπτω*, *Bapto*. For Proof hereof, let the places of Scripture already quoted (out of *Leigh's Critica Sacra*) be consulted, in all which places the Spirit speaks of Baptism, but not a Word of Dipping; and that by the Derivative Word *βαπτίζω*, *Baptizo*; never by the Primitive *Bapto*.

Seeing then it hath pleased the Holy Ghost to express Dipping or Plunging into by the Word *βάπτω*, but never by the Word *βαπτίζω*, *Baptizo*; and that he hath expressed Baptism by the Word *βαπτίζω*, but never by the Word *βάπτω*. I think none but Fools or mad Men will blame me for resolving to believe the Holy Ghost (in this matter) before I believe Dr. *Russel*, and all the humane Testimonies he hath quoted to make good his Cause: though he were able to quote a Million of Authors as witty and learned as his so much admired *Servetus* and *Castellio*.

The Premises considered, I hope the Dr. will not be displeased for making this fair and generous Offer to him, and all who espouse his Unscriptural Cause, (*viz.*) that if he, or they, can shew such a solid and

con-

convincing Reason (as doth not contradict the Analogie of Faith) why (or wherefore) the Holy Ghost should not in any of those Scriptures (where he expresseth Dipping) express Dipping by *βαπτίζω* the Derivative; but only by *βαπτω* the Primitive; and why he should not express Baptism in any of the places of Scripture above quoted, by the Primitive *βαπτω*, *Bapto*, but always by *Baptizo*, in case both *βαπτω* the Primitive, and *βαπτίζω* its Derivative do signifie the very same thing, viz. to Dip or Plunge under the Water: And I do faithfully promise him to own my self mistaken, and him to be (herein) in the right.

If he cannot, I then hope his misguided Profelytes, as well as himself, will ingeniously own themselves mistaken, and persist no longer in fighting against the Truth of God.

From the difference between the two Words in Letters, Syllables and Sound; as also from the Practice of the Holy Ghost, in using both the Words in the N. T.

I thus argue, Major. If the Words *βαπτω* and *βαπτίζω* do apparently differ in Letters, Syllables and Sound, and if the Holy Ghost do always express the Act of Dipping and Plunging by *Bapto*, never by *Baptizo*; and Baptism by *Baptizo*, never by *Bapto*; then the Word *Bapto* must signifie to Dip and Plunge, but never to Baptize; and the

Word *Baptizo* must signifie to Baptize, but never to Dip or Plunge under Water.

Assump. *But the Words Bapto and Baptizo do apparently differ in Letters, Syllables and Sound; and the Holy Ghost doth always express the Act of Dipping or Plunging by Bapto, never by Baptizo; and Baptism by Baptizo, never by Bapto.*

Conclusion, *Ergo the Word Bapto must signifie to Dip or Plunge, but never to Baptize; and the Word Baptizo must signifie to Baptize, but never to Dip or Plunge under Water.*

Besides this Argument, others shall be laid down to confirm this when I come to speak to his Third, viz. the Practice of the first Baptizers.

In the 2d. Place, our Dr. will have Baptizing to be only by Dipping or Plunging the whole body under Water: The Proof he gives (to make good his Assertion herein) are those Metaphors used in Holy Scripture: To represent it to our Understanding, he instances in two, in Page 8. viz. Burial and Resurrection.

He tells his Reader there, that our Lord Jesus hath not burthened us under the Gospel with a Multitude of Ceremonies, as it was in the Oeconomy of the Jews under the Legal Dispensation, but only with some few; and those very significant, this being
a more

a more Spiritual Dispensation. Before I meddle in speaking to his Metaphors, I will take Liberty to tell the World, that albeit Christ doth not burden us with a multitude of Ceremonies now, as under the Oeconomy of the Jews under the Legal Dispensation; yet this one Ceremony (of Baptism) will prove a heavier Yoke to Believers now than Circumcision with all the whole Body of Ceremonies appertaining to that Legal Dispensation, in case it must be administred by Dipping and Plunging the whole Body under Water, as Anabaptists say it must.

I come now to his Metaphors, the first whereof, he saith, is that of a Burial: For this, he and all of his Perswasion quote *Rom. 6. 4. and Colos. 2. 12. Buried with him in Baptism unto Death.* From this Metaphor of a Burial the Dr. and all his Party do hold and teach (for an infallible Truth) that the Scope and Design of the Apostle in the two places (now quoted) is to teach and set forth the Mode and Manner how Christ was buried, to the end Believers should (in Baptism) imitate the same: This (if I mistake them not, as I am very confident I do not) is the Sense and meaning wherein he and all Anabaptists take those Scriptures.

In answer to whom, I affirm that this their sense of those places is senseless, and meerly forc't to serve their own turn, in

proving that Dipping and Plunging (in Baptism) is the only true and right Baptism.

Now to discover their Mistake and Error herein, I shall offer but two things to Consideration.

The first is, to shew the Scope and Design of the Apostle in those places, which is not (as they fondly and injudiciously imagine) to shew that Christ was baptized by dipping, or that believers are to be so baptized.

But the Scope and Design of the Apostle in those places, is to set forth and prove that Suretyship Union, which is between Christ (the Mediatorial Head) and all the Members of his Body Mystical; there being no one Act of Obedience, either Active or Passive, which Christ, (the Mediator) performed in the assumed Nature, but all his Members are said to do and perform the same; and all the Effects and saving Benefits thereof do undoubtedly redound to all the Elect: and all this is signified and sealed in Baptism to every elected Sinner, whether Infant or Adult. And I cannot but reckon it a strange Infatuation on those who lay such Stress on the *Dutch* Translators, in the point of *John the Dooper*, (wherein silly and weak People do not a little glory and brag) that they should put such Sleights and Contempt on the *Dutch* Annotators, those

those great Lights of the World, in matter of Infants Right to Baptism, of *Abraham's* Covenant being a Covenant of absolute Grace, of Circumcision being the Initial Seal thereof, and Baptism succeeding in the room thereof; with sundry other material points in Gospel Religion, wherein they are sound and orthodox: Yet, in nothing must our Dr. and his Adherents make use of the *Dutch*, only *John the Dooper*, *John the Dooper*: And in this Commission, *de Salve Dopende*, Dipping them.

And what ground hath our Dr. to conclude, that had our *English Translators* turned the Words (about Baptism) into Dipping, as the *Dutch Translators* have done? (If it be as he saith) that therefore it must (necessarily) be so in the Original, or how will he prove the *Dutch Translators* nearer to Infallibility than our *English Translators* were? or that our *English Translators* would have been more infallible than they were, in case they had Translated *John the Baptist*, *Johannes de Dooper*; and in the Commission *Baptizing them*, *de salve Dopende*, Dipping them.

Secondly, If to imitate, and set forth Christ's Burial, be the Design of the Apostle, then must it (necessarily) follow, that it is Mens Duty to imitate it in all the Circumstances of a Burial, as well as in some.

Christ when he was buried, he was wholly Passive; he did not go into the Grave himself, but was laid in by others; so must Persons be in Baptism, they must be wholly Passive, they must not go into the Water themselves, but must be laid under the Water by the Administration of Baptism: Christ when buried was left in the Grave, so must the Person in Baptism; he must be left under the Water as long as Christ continued in the Grave, which was three Days and three Nights.

If any shall say it is absurd and ridiculous to think or say, that these Circumstances should be attended or imitated by Believers in Water Baptism, I say so too; and do farther say and affirm, that it is (altogether) as absurd and ridiculous for any to affirm and teach, that for Believers to set forth and imitate Christ's Burial is the Apostles Design in the above-mentioned Scriptures: If Anabaptists will be peremptory in asserting and teaching that to set forth and imitate Christ's Burial in those places, is the Scope and Design of the Apostle, they must give me leave to be as peremptory as they in affirming, that unless they imitate Christ's Burial in the Circumstances now mentioned, their Baptism (about which so great and confused a Noise is made in the World) is but a meer ludicrous (or mock) Baptism,

Baptism, for that they do not imitate Christ in their Baptism in those Circumstances which are so essentially necessary to set forth and represent his Death and Burial, in case it be as they hold it is.

To which I add, that our Baptizing by pouring out or sprinkling Water on the Subject, doth (every way) more exactly represent and set forth a Burial, than that of dipping and plunging the whole Body under Water.

The Truth of this will appear, if the Particulars following be seriously and without Prejudice considered.

First, In dipping and plunging into the Water, the Party baptized is Active, in going himself into the Water, which (indeed) ought not to be the Ordinance of Water-Baptism, being (in all respects) a Passive Ordinance, wherein the Subject is to be wholly Passive, as the Soul is in the Work of Regeneration.

The Work or Conversion or Regeneration is the Inward and Spiritual Baptism Administred by Christ. In this wonderful Work, the Dead Sinner hath no hand in effecting or producing the same, it is wholly done by Christ, the Administrator thereof. So in the outward Ordinance of Water-Baptism, (which is no more than the outward Sign or Seal of the Inward) the

Minister

Minister of the Gospel in Administring Baptism) must only be Active, the Subject must put forth no Act at all. The Party going himself into the Water, doth not represent and set forth a Dead Man : In pouring out or sprinkling Water on the Subject, the Party is wholly passive, as is a Dead Man when buried. Again, in Dipping and Plunging, the Party baptized is applied to the Water, not the Water to the Party, which is contrary to the manner of Burials, which all Men know is to lay the Corps on its Back in the Grave, and to pour out or sprinkle the Earth on it.

In baptizing by sprinkling or pouring out Water, the Party is laid on his back, and the Water poured out or sprinkled on him.

The Party Dead is never thrust into the Earth, but the Earth or Mould is poured out on him.

Now, whether of these two ways of baptizing by dipping and plunging, or that of Pouring out or Sprinkling Water upon, do more lively and exactly set forth and represent a Burial, let any (who have not lost their Senses) Judge.

As to the *Second Metaphor*, (viz.) A Resurrection, I humbly conceive, that what here follows may suffice to shew, that as Anabaptists do not (at all) hold forth or represent the Death and Burial of Christ in
their

their going into the Water, in their way) so neither do they set forth and represent his Resurrection, as they fancy they do.

First, It is most certain, that when the time determined by God's Decree for Christ's remaining in a State of Death was accomplished, (according to the Holy Scriptures) he raised up himself from the Grave. No hand of Men or Angels helpt to raise him. So that plain it is, if the Scriptures they alledge for this, be to be taken in a literal Sense, then must it needs follow, that as he that Administers Baptism by Dipping or Burying the whole Body under Water, doth Administer Baptism in that way of Burying under the Water, to the end the Party so Baptized might lively set forth the Death and Burial of Christ; so he must leave the Party Buried in the Water, to raise up himself, that so he might represent Christ in his raising up himself from the Grave. If this were practised, it would not be hard to guess, how many Profelytes they would get to join with them in this their Fantastical new Mode of Baptizing. And truly, for my part, I cannot see how they can be excused from doing the one as well as the other, seeing that the Metaphor must be prosecuted in all its parts, as well as in some. And thus they may see what they are like to

to get, by building their Confidence on misunderstood and wrested Metaphors.

I come now to the Doctor's *Third Medium*, whereby he labours to prove, that the right way of Baptizing under the Gospel, is (and must be) by Dipping and Plunging the whole Body under Water, (*viz.*) The Practice of the first Baptizers. In this he is as full of Confidence as he was in the other two, I have now dismiss; and I hope, in the Goodness of God it will plainly be demonstrated, that (in this also) he and his Adherents do pervert the Scriptures, which gives us the Account of the first Baptizers, as they (most certainly) do the other Scriptures, which they bring to justify and make good their Soul deluding Dreams.

He begins with *John the Baptist*, Page 10. where he tells his Reader, that it doth appear that Dipping is the right way of Baptizing from the first Baptizers; The first mention (saith he) of this Ordinance of Holy Baptism, we have in *Mat. 3. 1.* where *John the Dipper* is mentioned; and so he goes on in a strange kind of Rapsody, warbling out his so much affected Note, Dipping and Plunging. I shall not be concerned to follow the Dr. (*Pedetentim*) step by step in his *Pedantick* way, least I should be found guilty of the same empty Tautologies.

logies wherewith his so much admired Epistle abounds.

The ground of his Mistake herein, is the wrong Etymology he gives of the Word βαπτίζω, which he and his mistaken Testimonies take to signifie and mean Dipping and Plunging the whole Body under Water.

This Etymologie of his I have overthrown, as the Reader may see, if he look back to the first Head of the Dispute, viz. the Etymologie of the Word βαπτίζω. I shall not repeat but go on to confirm the Truth of the Etymologie I have given of the Word βαπτίζω, from the Word of God, and the best Greek Authors, by such Arguments as (I hope in Christ) will prove irrefragable.

The first shall be grounded on the necessity of *John Baptist*, his harmonizing with the Pen-Men of the *Old Testament* in all the parts of his Ministry, if the Dr. will grant (as he must) if he speak Truth that his *John the Dooper* was a true and faithful Prophet of God, he must of necessity grant that *John* did run parallel with *Moses* and the other Prophets.

This the Dr. must either grant or deny, if he grant that *John* did run exactly parallel with *Moses* and the other Prophets, then it is beyond all Contradiction that *John* administred Baptism by pouring out
or

er sprinkling Water on the Persons he baptized; for most certain it is, that *Moses* (under the Ceremonial Dispensation) did apply all the Legal Washings and Purifications by Water, (which all had a Typical relation to Christ to come, as *John's* Baptism also had) by pouring out or sprinkling the Water: The Prophets also (witness those two great Prophets *Isa.* and *Ezek.*) they foretold of the manner how God would apply to his People the two great Benefits accruing by his Sons Mediatorial Sacrifice, (*viz.*) Justification and Sanctification, which was to be by sprinkling, as will evidently appear by *Isa.* 52. 15. *Then shall he sprinkle many Nations, &c.* and *Ezek.* 36. 25. *Then will I sprinkle clean Water upon you, &c.* In these places the Spirit of Christ (in his Prophets) had an Eye to the Baptismal Washings of the *New-Testament* Dispensation. Now if *John Baptist* did (in all the parts of his Ministry) harmonize with *Moses* and the other Prophets, he did (undoubtedly) baptize by pouring out or sprinkling Water on those he baptized; for most certain it is, (as hath been already observed) pouring out or sprinkling was the Mode or Way of Application of all the Ceremonial Washings which were used before *John's* Baptism.

If the Dr. and his Adherents deny that

John

John did run (exactly) parallel with *Moses* and the other Pen-men of Holy Scriptures, then is *John the Dooper* (by them) made a false Prophet; and all who (from *John*) take up and practise the Mode of Dipping the whole Body under Water, (as the only right Baptism) are self-condemned in that they do (herein) follow one who contradicted the Spirit of God in the other Prophets.

And so (hereby) it appears how much *John the Baptist* is obliged to the Dippers of our Age, who (rather than they will lose their silly Opinion) will have the Spirit of Truth to speak Nonsense, (yea, contradict himself) and *John* the greatest of all the other Prophets (because the immediate fore-runner of Christ) to be a false Prophet.

This Stain they will never be able to wash off their Name, any other way than by honestly acknowledging that *John* did (in all the parts of his Ministry) harmonize with *Moses* and the other Prophets; the which if they once grant, (as they must if they speak by the Holy Ghost) then is their Cause lost, and *John* no more to be Stiled *John the Dooper*, but *John the Baptizer*.

From what hath been said, I argue thus. If *John Baptist* did (in all the parts of his Mini-

Ministry) harmonize and agree with *Moses* and the other Prophets, then did he Administer Baptism by pouring out or sprinkling Water upon those he baptized : But *John Baptist* did (in all the parts of his Ministry) harmonize and agree with *Moses* and the other Prophets.

Therefore *John Baptist* did Administer Baptism by pouring out or sprinkling Water on those he baptized.

A second Argument shall be grounded on Impossibility, thus: That way of baptizing which is impossible to be practised (without a miraculous Strength of Body) was never commanded by Christ, nor practised by *John* ; but to baptize the many Multitudes which came to *John's* Baptism, by Dipping the whole Body under Water, was a thing altogether impossible, seeing *John* had no miraculous Strength of Body to render him capable of such an arduous and difficult Administration.

Therefore that way of Baptizing, by Dipping the whole Body under Water, was never commanded by Christ, nor practised by *John*.

The major Proposition will not be denied, the Assumption will readily be subscribed, (as an unquestionable Truth) if Men who plead for that way of Dipping will be but ingenious in doing two things, *First*,
in

in lifting up in their Arms (cleverly from the Earth) the many Corpulent Bodies which offer themselves to Baptism, lay them under the Water, and there hold them until the Administrator pronounce the Words of Institution, *I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Secondly, in sincerely acknowledging what Experience teaches them concerning this Practice; these two Particulars comply'd in, will (I doubt not) put the matter now in Debate out of all Question, that to baptize in that way of taking up in the Arms, and laying under Water the most Corpulent Bodies who offer to Baptism, and to hold them under the Water till the Words of Institution be pronounced; is a thing altogether impossible, not only in respect of the Administrator, whose bodily Strength must (in an ordinary way) sink and fail in lifting and holding up (so long) such massy, ponderous Weights: And also in respect of the Subject, who must (undoubtedly) be in great Fear and in apparent Danger of being let fall, if not of being suffocated or smothered in the Water.

And strange it is to me, that Arminians who plead so much for the universal Love and Mercy of God to Mankind (in general,) should not see how full of Reflection
on

on God, this Principle of theirs is, which makes the God of Love and Mercy, the Author of such a Mode or Way of baptizing, which is not possible to be practised, without apparent Danger, both to Health and Life, of both the Subject and the Administrator too.

I conclude this Argument with the Saying of judicious *Sydenham*, viz. *That if Baptism be to be Administred in that way of Dipping only, happy are those who live in hot Climates, or who have Bodies of Brass.*

A *Third* Argument may be grounded on *Scandal*, thus; That Mode or Way of Baptizing, which is both immodest, and tends to excite lustful Motions and carnal Desires in Men and Women, cannot be commanded by Christ; neither was the same ever practised by *John*. But that way of baptizing by dipping the whole Body under Water, is both immodest, and tends to excite lustful Motions and carnal Desires in Men and Women.

Therefore that Mode of baptizing by dipping the whole Body under Water, was never commanded by Christ, neither was the same ever practised by *John*.

He who commands all Matters (relating to Divine Worship) to be done decently, and in order, 1 Cor. 14. 40. and who commands Believers to abstain from all Appea-

pearance of Evil, *Thou* 5. 22. can never be the Author of such disorderly Practises, as thwart and contradict his own general Rules. Now, whether it be not an Immodest and unseemly Sight, to see a mixt Company of Men and Women stand in Garments, (to use Mr. *Sydenham's* Expression) next to Nakedness it self: Let any (not bereav'd of common Modesty) judge: And whether the Administrator can (possibly) handle the Female Sex, as he doth (when actually dipping them,) and not feel the Risings and Motions of Concupiscence in his Nature; I leave to thinking Persons to determine and judge.

Again, in the *Fourth* place, (to add no more) let the last Argument be grounded on the Analogie, which is (and must be) between the Baptism of *John* and that of Christ. The Argument is thus framed.

If Christ's Way and Manner of Administring the Inward Spiritual Baptism (whereof that of *John* was but the Outward Visible Sign) be by sprinkling or pouring out upon: then *John* did (certainly) baptize by sprinkling or pouring out the Water on those he baptized:

But Christ's Way and Manner of Administring the Inward Spiritual Baptism, is by sprinkling or pouring out upon.

There-

Therefore *John* did (certainly) baptize by sprinkling or pouring out Water on those he baptized.

If there was a Necessity that *John* should harmonize with *Moses*, the Ceremonial Law, and the Prophets, I cannot see any Reason why he should not be as greatly concern'd to harmonize with Christ himself: And seeing that the manner of Christ's Administring the Inward and Spiritual Baptism, is by Pouring out and Sprinkling the Graces of the Spirit upon the Souls of the Elect in the Work of Regeneration, why *John* (the fore-runner of Christ) should Administer his Baptism (which was but an External Sign of Christ's) by Dipping or Plunging the whole Body into the Water, can never be demonstrated by all the Wit and conceited Skill in our Doctor, though he were as well vers'd in all the Roots and Heemantique Nouns of the *Hebrew* Tongue, as his so much admired *Robertson* was: And if the Doctor will not be offended, I am very desirous to know if his so highly commended and admired *Robertson* was (by his so great Excellency in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Tongues) more Infallibly acquainted with the Mind of the Holy Ghost than other Men; and that Mr. *Robertson* did certainly believe, that the

Etymo-

Etymology, which he gave of the Word *Baptizo*, was infallible as he said. How came it to pass, that the Learned *Robertson* did not renounce that Baptism, which he received in Infancy and by Sprinkling?

I think I knew Master *William Robertson* as well as Dr. *Russel*; and during the time of my Acquaintance with him, I am sure, he was far enough from Anabaptism. All the Skill he had in the Tongues, with his Acquaintance in the Arts, did not convince him, that the Baptism he received in Infancy, and by sprinkling, was a Nullity, as the Doctor holds it is.

But to return to *John the Dooper*, I think fit to assure the Doctor, that I own myself bound to believe *John* himself, rather than Doctor *Russel*, or any of those Learned men he so greatly brags of. The Words of *John* are so plain, that I can see no need of a Commentator to explain their Sense; he tells us in *Mar. 1. 8.* and in *Mat. 3. 11.* that he did baptize with Water; but that Christ should baptize with the Ghost: *ἐν ὕδατι* and *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, do both intend and signifie the very same way and manner of Administration: All the difference between *John* and Christ, in both their Baptisms, is in the subject Matter, *viz.* In the outward Water and the inward Grace: *John* he did Administer Water,
the

the outward Sign ; but Christ he did Administer the Spiritual Grace : but as touching the manner, it was (most certainly) the very same in both.

Now, if the Doctor grant, (as he must if he speak Truth) that Christ doth Administer the Inward and Spiritual Baptism, by Pouring out or Sprinkling the Graces of the Holy Ghost, he will find it (altogether) incongruous, and no way agreeing with the Analogie of Faith, to hold or assert, that *John* did Administer the outward Sign in such a manner as was directly contrary to Christ. There must be (necessarily) an harmonious Agreement between the Sign and the Thing signified thereby, which can never be, in case Christ Baptizes by or with, Pouring out or Sprinkling ; and *John* should Baptize by Dipping or Plunging into.

As Christ applies the Graces of the Spirit to the Soul in Conversion, not the Soul to the Spirit ; so in the outward Baptism *John* he apply'd the Water (the outward Sign) to the Person, not the Person to the Water.

For making the Thing or Point (now in Debate) obvious and plain to the meanest Capacity, let it be seriously considered how plain and express the Scriptures are in affirming, that Christ's Way or Manner is

Admin

Administring the Spiritual Baptism, is by Pouring out and Sprinkling the Holy Spirit on the Souls, which he regenerates, but never by applying the Souls to the Holy Spirit, read (without Prejudice) *Tit. 3. 5, 6. Not by Works of Righteousness, which we have done, but according to his Mercy, he hath saved us by the washing of Regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.*

ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, hath powered on us, the very same Word is made use of in *Acts 2. 17. And it shall come to pass in the last Days, (saith God) I will pour out my Spirit on all Flesh,* ἐκχεῶ ἐπὶ τὸ πνεῦματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα. Both which places are the fulfilling of those Gracious Promises in *Isa. 44. 3. and Joel 2. 28* where the Lord promised, that he will pour Water on him that is thirsty, &c. and his Spirit on the Churches Seed. The Hebrew Word in *Isa.* is, רוחי אצב, *itzek Ruchi*; and in *Joel* the Word used to express the same thing by is, אטמור את רוחי, *shpoch Eth Ruchi*: in neither of which places will our Doctor's אטמור אלהם *Ke-be lu Otham*: And Dip ye them, be found. The Doctor, the better to help his limping Profelytes over the Style of Heresie and Error, tells his Reader that the Evangelist *Matthew* wrote his Gospel in the He-
F brew

brew Tongue ; for Proof whereof, he sets down his own Opinion, that so it is ; and this Opinion of his he confirms (as infallible) by the Testimony of *Jerom*, and (he thinks) the Opinion of the most Learned Men : But the Dr. was so wary in this point, that he resolved the Reader should not (easily) find him out in his Quotations, the which the Doctor knew would easily be done, had he (fairly) directed his Reader to the Book and Page in *Jerom* where his Judgment concerning this matter is exprest, and by naming the Learned Men, who were one with him and *Jerom* in this Opinion : His Neglect herein forces me to charge him with Unfairness, (to say no worse) if that be a true Rule in Logick *Dolus latet in Universalibus*, that Deceit lie hid in Universals ; I am sure the Doctor (as well as the rest of his Fraternity, who frequently walk in this Path) must fall under this Lash ; the Drs. Lothness to name the Learned Men who were of his Opinion in this, causes me to suspect that he means such as his Learned Baptist *Servetus* and his famous *Castellio*, with those other *Arminian* and *Popish* Authors, whose Names are in his Book.

It were worth while for the Reader to observe what shifts the poor Man is put to to prove and make good (from God's Word

his new, (though falsely pretended ancient)
Mode of baptizing, by Dipping and Plun-
ging the whole Body into the Water.

He tells his Reader that *Matthem* wrote
his Gospel in *Hebrew* ; the Drs. Design
being (no doubt) to make way for his *He-*
brew Words, *ושברר ארדום* and *Dip ye*
them. The root, saith he, is *Tabal*, which
is the third Person Singular of the *Preter-*
perfect Tense, and signifies he Dipped : He
instances in *Naaman the Syrian*, *2 Kings* 5.
14. *Then went he down and Dipped himself*
seven times in Jordan, &c. From *Naaman*
the Syrian the Dr. comes (*per saltum*) by a
long leap to *John Baptizing in Jordan* ; in
Mat. 3. 6. you have, saith he, the same
Words again in the Passive Voice, which
must be rendred in *English*, *And were Dip-*
ed of him in Jordan : And in *Ver.* 16. you
have the same root again as it is applied to
our Saviour, *And Jesus when he was Dipped*
went up straightway out of the Water.

The Dr. takes for granted, that because
abal signifies he Dipped, and that because
Naaman (in the place above quoted) Dip-
ed himself in *Jordan* ; that therefore in
Matthem it must needs be *Vetabelu Otham,*
and Dip ye them ; and that *John* did dip all
Baptized, over Head and Ears in *Jor-*
n.

Am I bound to believe that *Matthew* did write his Gospel in *Hebrew*, because the Dr. is of the Opinion he did?

Or, must I therefore grant it because *Jerom* is of his Opinion? though neither *Jerom* nor he gives any solid Reasons for that their Opinion.

Two things convince me that both *Jerom* the Dr. and his pretended Learned Men were all mistaken in this their Opinion.

First, I find (by Reading) that the Gospel which *Matthew* is supposed to have written in *Hebrew* was never yet seen by any Author, and therefore I must mind him of the Maxim, as true and applicable in the present case, *De non apparentibus, & non existentibus eadem est Ratio*, of things not appearing, and of things not existing, there is the same Reason to be given.

Secondly, If *Matthew* had written his Gospel in *Hebrew*, he would not have translated into *Greek* the Word *Emmanuel* in *Mat.* 1. 23. and those whole Sentence *Eli, Eli, Lamma Sababthani*, in *Mat.* 27. 46.

But suppose I should (for Argument sake) grant, which I utterly deny, and challenge the Dr. to make good, that *Matthew* had Written his Gospel in the *Hebrew* Tongue, doth it therefore follow (necessarily) that the Holy Ghost, (who is so exact and precise)

cise in choosing the most apt and fit Words whereby to express his Mind) should use the *Hebrew* Word טָבַל *Tabal*, which signifies to Dip, and not the Word רָחַץ *Rachatz*, which signifies to Wash, or כָּבַס *Kibbem*, which signifies the same: I have already demonstrated from the Word of God, that in all the places of the New-Testament where the Holy Ghost makes mention of Baptism, he doth it by the Derivative βαπτίζω, which signifies to Wash, by Pouring out or Sprinkling Water upon, but never by the Primitive βαπτω, *Bapto*, which signifies to Dip or Plunge into: And when the Holy Ghost expresseth the Act of Dipping or Plunging into, he doth it by the Primitive βαπτω, which signifies to Dip into, but never by the Derivative βαπτίζω, which signifies to Wash with; by which it plainly appears (to me at least) that rather than the Doctor will lose his Credit, and suffer his rotten Cause to be lost, he will rather open door to the old *Babel* Confusion of Tongues, resolving (Jesuit like) to set the Pen-Men of Holy Scripture together by the Ears, and impose on his credulous Reader a real Belief, that what the Holy Ghost hath laid down (and plainly expresseth) in *Greek*, he hath gainsaid and contradicted in *Hebrew*; which Contradiction can never befall the Pen-Men of the Holy Scripture, nor (with-

out Blasphemy) be charged on that Holy Spirit, by which they were Acted and infallibly Inspired.

The Reason which *Jerom* gives why *Matthew* writ his Gospel in *Hebream*, viz for the Sake of those *Jews* which believed is no Reason at all; for had it been the Will of God it should be so, I know no Reason why *Peter*, *James* and *Paul*, (who all three wrote to the *Jews* which believed) should write in *Greek*, not in *Hebream*; witness the two Epistles of *Peter*, the Epistle of *James*, and that of *Paul* to the *Hebrews*.

The Dr. pleaseth himself in telling his Reader, that in Mr. *William Robertson's* *Hebrew* New Testament, he finds these Words between the 18th and 19th Verse (of *Mat.* 28. he means) *And as my Father hath sent me, even so also I send you. Go ye therefore, &c.*

These Words he sets down in the *Hebream* Character, telling his Reader that he find them not in any *Greek* Copy.

An Argument thinks he) that *Matthew* wrote his Gospel in *Hebream*: a meer *Non sequitur*: What though those Words be not in *Matthew*, I hope he will not deny that they are in *Jo.* 20. 21. there the Spirit of God hath recorded them; and why the Dr. should look to find them in *Matthew* I know no Reason, or wherefore his Learned

Friend

Friend Mr. *Robertson* should take on him to place the Words recorded by *John*, between the 18th and 19th of *Mat.* 28. I cannot conceive. But whatever moved *Robertson* to so presumptuous an Act, in taking on him to alter things of this Nature, (as if by his Skill (in the *Hebrew* Tongue) he thought himself able to rectifie the Order in which the Holy Ghost hath set down his own Mind in Writing) I doubt not but the Dr. was well pleased with so palpable an Aberration; and all for the Love and Liking he hath to his טבול *Tabal*, he Dipped, and ולמד *Velammadu*, Disciple ye. By what I have said, it is easie to judge, that could the Dr. but have his Will in two things. First, that the Word βαπτίζω, *Baptizo*, doth alway signifie the very same thing with its Primitive βαπτω.

And Secondly, that *Matthew* did write his Gospel in the *Hebrew* Tongue, and that the Words וטבלו אתם *Vetabelu otham*, and Dip ye them, were the very Words of *Matthew*. All the Art in Men and Angels could never hinder but that Dipping the whole Body under the Water must needs be the only right way of administering the outward Baptism.

But both these (on which he erects his tottering Structure of Anabaptism) I utterly deny, and do fairly offer, and sincerely

cerely promise him, that if he can confute (by God's Word) the Arguments laid down to prove him mistaken in both, I will forthwith Renounce my Baptism received in Infancy and by Sprinkling, as a meer Nullity and not only so, but I will in Pulpit and Print too, Declare (to the World) that I am fully convinced that Dipping the whole Body (under Water) is the only right way of administering Water-Baptism under the New Testament Dispensation.

And this, (I hope with the Offer made him, in clearing up the Etymology of the Word *Baptizo*) will prove as generous an Offer as he made to Master James.

As touching what is (usually) objected from *Mat.* 3. 16. concerning Christ's coming up out of the Water. And from *Acts* 8. 38, 39. concerning *Philip* and the Eunuch going down into, and coming up again out of the Water ; I need say but two things.

First, For any to affirm (positively what the Word of God affirms not, is (to me) a sure Argument of an Ignorant, Rash and Presumptuous Spirit. Reader, mark the Words : *And Jesus, when he was Baptized, went up straightway out of (Greek εν not εκ, from not out of) the Water.* The Text doth not say, (in downright Terms) that Christ was Dipt under the Water

Water; neither doth it appear from *Acts* 16. 38, 39. that the Eunuch was Dipt, only the Doctor (and his Adherents) will have it to be so, right or wrong.

Secondly, There is nothing more certain than that a Person may be said (properly enough) to go down into the Water though he go not in above Shooe (or Ankle) deep, which (I doubt not) was practised by both *John* and by *Philip*, in the places abovementioned; and that for the better conveniency of catching hold of the Water with their Hands, in order to sprinkle or pour out the same on those they Baptized.

And that which may convince any Man, (not prepossessed with Prejudice against the Truth I here contend for) that this was the Practice of *John*, and all the first Baptizers, (so much brag'd of by the Dr.) is the Impossibility of the Spirit's being the Author of any (though the least) Contradiction in any part of God's Worship.

Hence I argue. That which can no way be prov'd or made good by express Testimony of God's Word, or deduced therefrom by sound (and necessary) Consequence, is an Invention in God's Worship, which God will reject and abominate as not appointed by him.

But Dipping the whole Body under Water in Baptism, can no way be prov'd or made good by exprefs Testimony of God's Word, nor yet by sound (or necessary) Consequence deduced therefrom.

Therefore Dipping the whole Body under Water (in Baptism) is an Invention in God's Worship, which God will reject and abominate, because not appointed by him.

The major Proposition will not be denied. That which secures the minor, and proves the Conclusion to be the Truth (which all the Wit of the Adversary will never be able to prevail against) is the Scriptures Silence, in that it no where gives an exprefs Witness (or Testimony) hereto. And the Impossibility of that being prov'd a sound Consequence / from God's Word, which makes God the Author of Self-Contradiction.

The Word of God no where commands Dipping in Baptism, neither doth it say (in exprefs terms) that either *John* or any of the Apostles did Baptize by Dipping under the Water. Reader, keep the Adversary close to this, where doth the Word *Dip* appear, either in the Command of Christ (when speaking of Baptizing) or in any Instance of Persons Baptized by *John* or the Apostles? If thou keep close to this, the Enemy will retreat and fly to Consequence.

quence; the which, if he doth, (as no doubt he will) do thou pursue him with a Holy Courage, be not afraid of his daring Brags. How do you prove that to be a sound and Scriptural Consequence, which makes the Holy Spirit of God the Author of Self-Contradiction?

That thus it is, (will evidently) appear, the Adversary can no way avoid it. If thou urge, (with an Holy Zeal for Truth) what is (Graphically) set down in God's own VVord, concerning the manner of Application of the Blood of the Sacrifices, and the VVaters of Purifications, both which had a Typical Relation to the Spiritual Baptism, administred by the Spirit of Christ. These were applied under the Ceremonial Administration, by Sprinkling, not by Dipping, (as has been before observed.) The Prophets, who foretold of Christ, and the great Benefits which should come by him to Believers under the Gospel. They set it forth by Sprinkling, witness *Isa.* 52. 15. and *Ezek.* 36. 25. And in the Gospel we are assured, that the Spirit of Christ doth apply the Inward Spiritual Baptism, by Sprinkling or Pouring out the Graces of his Spirit on the Soul in the VVork of Regeneration, see *Tit.* 3. 6.

Now to affirm, that Christ either commands Dipping, or that he (himself) was Dipped

Dipped in Baptism, what is it but to affirm, that Christ's Spirit doth contradict himself? What is pretended (for Dipping) from *John* 3. 23. hath nothing in it to help their Cause, but what empty Conceit and unscriptural Confidence supply. *John* (saith the Adversary) was Baptizing in *Amon*, because there was much Water there: Therefore he Baptized by Dipping the whole Body under the Water.

The Strefs (or Weight) of the Argument is laid on a fond Conceit, that much Water (there) signifies and imports the Greatness and Depth of Water, which (plainly) appears to be otherwise, witness the *Greek*, ὕδατα πολλὰ, many Waters, denoting rather the many Rivulets or Springs of Water, wherewith that place abounded, than that the Waters of that place were deep. And it was (I doubt not) for Conveniency sake, that *John* left *Bethabarah*, (a place of deeper Water) because *Amon* was (every way) more convenient and commodious for the Multitudes of People, which came daily to his Baptism.

Piscator's Note upon the place, may not (here) be either improper or impertinent to the Purpose in hand, *Videntur significare Mures Rivi, non autem unum magnum Flumen. Many Rivulets, not one great Flood or Water, seems (here) to be signified*, saith that Learned

ed Author; with whom agrees the best Geographers who give the Description of that place.

I conclude my Treatise (against Dipping in Baptism) with that Saying of Godly and Judicious Sydenham: *If (saith he) there be any absolute need of Dipping, it is to cool the Heat of those Mens Spirits, who deny Baptism to be true (or right) Baptism, because not Administred by Plunging or Dipping.*

Reader: Observe, that as in the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper, it is not so much the Quantity of the Wine drunk in that Ordinance, (by a Believer) as the Quality, which signifies and represents the Blood of Christ.

Christ doth not tye a Believer up to such or such a Quantity of Wine to be drunk in Remembrance of his Blood shed, but (only) commands Wine to be drunk, leaving to the Discretion of the Believer, what Quantity to drink.

So in Water-Baptism it is not the Depth or Quantity of Water which is necessary to right Baptism, but real Water; it matters not how small the Quantity be, so there be but a Sprinkling (or Pouring out) of Water on the Subject, to represent the Sprinkling (or Pouring out) of the Graces of God's Spirit on the Elect Soul in Effectual Calling.

The

The Pretended Antiquity of Dipping (in Baptism) overthrown, by the most Ancient Antiquity.

Since I appeared in Print, in vindicating the Right of Believers Infant-Seed to Baptism, the (Seal of God's Covenant) I met with a Nameless Author, who, by his Book, seems willing to be accounted, not only an incomparable Antiquary, but a matchless Linguist.

This Author, by the flourishes he makes, hopes to drive all before him; so as the Antagonists he fights against shall, in vain, expect any Relief from either the Original Tongues or Antiquity, in Favour of Infant Baptism, or Sprinkling in that Ordinance.

He perceiving what a Loss the Men of that Perswasion are at, in making good their Doctrine of Immersion, in baptizing, enters the Stage, brandishing the Sword of his affected florid Style; backt with a (*Ruffel* like) Confidence, that neither Master *Malleus*, his Anonimous Author, nor any of the *London* Ministers, are able to

stand

stand before him in opposing what he offers (from Antiquity) to prove, *viz.* Immersion (or Dipping) to be the only right way of baptizing.

This Nameless Author, when computing the Numbers of Divines (both Ancient and Modern) which he brags, were for Immersion, and against Sprinkling: All which, he affirms, understood the Word *Baptizo*, in his Sense: He forgot that Maxim (known to every School-Boy who hath learned his Grammar) *Humanum est errare*. It is the Property of Humane Nature to err, and go astray.

A Maxim never yet deny'd by any of those Divines (either Ancient or Modern) of whom, he so greatly boasts, that I know of.

Agreeing with this Maxim, is that of Paul. Yea let God be true, but every Man a Liar, Rom. 3. 4.

From this it appears (uncontroulably) sure, and (infallibly) certain; that (since *Adam's* Fall) no (meer) Man can pretend to Infallibility.

This belongs to him (alone) who most justly styles himself, the Ancient of Days, *Dan. 7. 9.* The unerring Spirit of this ancient of Days, (whose revealed Will is the true Antiquity) assures us, (by Elihu) that
great

great Men are not always wise, neither do the aged understand Judgment, Job 32. 9.

On this very Account, *viz.* the Fallibility of the wisest and best of Men, All Believers are by Christ (the Wisdom of God) dehorted from calling any Man their Father or their Master, *Mat. 23. 9.* On the same Account likewise is it, that *Paul* shun'd to Preach Christ in the florid Style and enticing Words of Man's Wisdom (a Vanity too much affected by our Nameless Author, and too many Preachers of this Age, who study more to advance their own Fame and Party than they do to Preach Christ into the Hearts of Sinners) that the Faith of true Believers might not stand in the Wisdom of Men, but in the Power of God. *1 Cor. 3. 5.*

I am not more confident of any thing (meerly humane) than I am of this, *viz.* that were those very Ancient and Modern Divines (our Nameless Author so greatly brags of) now living, they would not only acknowledge that God's revealed Will was before their Learning and Wisdom; but they would (also) acknowledge themselves mistaken and overseen, about the Sense of the Words now in Dispute.

If the sacred Scripture then be the true and infallible Antiquity, whereon we are to ground our Faith, in all Matters Divine.

It (most conspicuously) appears, how fraudulently our Nameless Author lays about him with the meretricious Paint of his orate and polite Style; and his single Parts and Learning, wherein (possibly) both himself and his Party may conceit him a None-such, to amuse and divert his credulous and unwary Readers, from the plain Word of God, which he cannot but see (if not wilfully blind) is full against him, in the present Controversie) that in Pretence of Antiquity, and the Judgment of Modern Divines; being all of his Opinion, in the Point of Immersion. He may (craftily) draw Men into a self-pleasing Neglect, of looking into, or not minding the apparent difference between the Primitive *Βάπτω*, and *Βαπτίζω*, *Bapto* and *Baptizo*, its Derivative; a thing so plain, that any Man, but ordinarily skilled in the *Greek*, may readily perceive, that this Discovery, hath given the Doctrine of Immersion (or Dipping) such a Wound, as nothing can help, or cure, but a new Gospel from Heaven, which is (directly) opposite to that Gospel which the Son of God deliver'd from his Father, the which, when our Nameless Author procures, I shall then, never before, be of his Perswasion (therein) albeit he spake with the Tongue of Men, and Angels. Yea *Tertullian* himself, of whom our Nameless Author seems

to

to be very fond in this Point of Immerſion, will tell him, that *Antiquitas ſine Veritate, nihil aliud eſt, niſi veluſtas Erroris.* That *Antiquity without Truth, is but the very mould of Error.*

And in another place, treating of the Holy Scriptures, he hath this Saying, *Surge Veritas, & ſcrutare Scripturas tuas.* *Arise Truth, and ſearch thy own Scriptures* Intimating (thereby) that whatever (in Religion) that is not grounded on God's Word is corrupt, and, as ſuch, to be rejected, how ancient ſoever the ſame may be.

According hereto, the ſame *Tertullian*, when he had to do with the *Hereticks* of his time: who (to maintain their *Hereſies* in Oppoſition to the true Religion) plead- ed Antiquity, crying out, *Quod Antiquum, id verum.* That which is Ancient, is true. Where- to he (ſeaſonably) reply'd. *Quod Antiquiſſimum, id veriſſimum.* That which is moſt Ancient, is moſt true.

Theſe Sayings of *Tertullian*, I preſume our Nameleſs Author either over-lookt (when ſearching Antiquity) or, at leaſt, thought it not for his Purpoſe to take notice of them; they being not for his turn. That *Βαπτο* (the Primitive) is always uſ'd, in the New-Teſtament, to expreſs Dipping by: but never *Βαπτίζο* its Derivative. And that

that βαπτίζω its Derivative, is always us'd to exprefs Washing; by Pouring out Water on the Subject, but never βάπτω, hath been made good by Master *Mallens* his Anonymous, and remains still unconfuted, and is like so to be, untill (as hath been already hinted) a New Gospel be procured from Heaven, &c.

And why our Nameless Author should think it strange, as well as unlikely, that such Wise and Learned Men, as the Ancient and Modern Divines, on whom the Stress of his Argument depends, should be all mistaken about the Sense and Signification of the Words, now in Dispute, I cannot tell, unless for want of (duly) considering, that these Ancients had (incautiously) imbib'd (or drunk in) some of that Smoak of Error which poysoned and corrupted those Primitive and Purest Churches planted by the Ministry of the Apostles.

And that the Modern Divines, who succeeded them, had (from an over-weaning Conceit of those Ancients) been more acquainted with the Truth of the Gospel, than themselves: because of their bordering so near on the time of the Apostles, they were the apter to acquiesce in the Sense of those Words: as the same was handed down to them by those Ancients, without looking any further.

As many (yet living) have ingenuouſly acknowledged, that they themſelves have done: having taken theſe very Words rather upon truſt, than tryal: according to the unerring Standard of God's Holy Word.

Gods with-holding many Secrets (relating to the Myſteries of the Goſpel) in the viſible Churches here on Earth, from the moſt ſagacious and quick-ſighted Saints, is not at all to be wondered at. Becauſe in all his (Providential) Diſpenſations, towards his Children (while in a ſtate of Imperfection) he acts in a way of uncontrollable Sovereignty.

To ſome of his Servants he gives an Excellency in one Gift, and to others he gives to excel in another Gift. To one, he beſtows one Measure, both of Gifts and Grace; and to another, he beſtows a quite contrary Measure.

In all which Diversity of Diſpenſation, he is moſt free and unlimited. Neither may any of the Sons of Men ſay (or enquire) Why doth he ſo? *Job. 33. 13. Eph. 1. 11. Ephes. 4. 7.*

The great Diversity of Gifts wherein the Servants of Chriſt excelled one the other (in every Age of the Church) is a convincing Argument, to evince what I have now aſſerted.

Nay, the very Personal Experience of every true Believer, will confirm the same.

Nemo Mortalium omnibus Horis sapit. No Mortal is wise at all hours. I may add, nor in all Matters.

That Proverbial Saying (still in use among the Learned) *Bernardus non videt omnia.* Bernard saw not all things, may (without any Reflection) be properly enough applied to the most Learned and Wise, of all those Ancient and Modern Divines, made use of, in the Business of Immersion.

I question not but God (the great Sovereign of the World) hath reserved many things to be made known to the Churches in the latter Days, which have been hid from the Ancient and Modern Divines now boasted of.

And in case the Discovery made of the Difference between *Βαπτισμα* and *Βαπτισμο*, which doth so manifestly nonplus and stagger the greatest Champions for Immersion) be one of those many things, what hath any to object against God for his letting so many of his eminent and dearly beloved Saints go out of the World ignorant of what he is now pleased to discover, and make known? And what though such a Discovery be made by the meanest and most despised of those called to labour in his Son's Vineyard; that his Sovereign Grace might

might honour those of his despised Ambassadors, who (on the account of the small Figure they make in this World) are slighted and neglected by the Rich and most Fam'd, among their Brethren, in sacred Office ; is not the Discovery worth Acceptance ?

I do not doubt, but were such a Discovery made, by one of the Ministers in high Esteem, among the Men of this Age, their Fame would be celebrated throughout both City and Country.

But woe, and alas ! the poor Man is forgotten by his Neighbours, and his Words are not heard. And that because he is poor. *Eccles. 9. 15, 16.*

Master Immerfer (so I style him from the Title given to his Book) he conceals his Name, for what Reason, I no more know, than I know the Reason why Master *Mallens* concealed my Name (styling me (in his Book) Anonymous) notwithstanding my Name is to be seen in the Title-Page of my Book : out of which Master Immerfer suspects he stole that Observation about the Difference between the 2 Words Βάπτισμα and Βαπτίζω, (which with the Argument grounded thereupon) hath left the Patrons and greatest Champions for Immersion, in a Labyrinth, not knowing how (possibly) to work themselves and their bleeding Cause out of the same. When

When Master Immerfer should, like a candid and fair Antagonist, who seeks the Honour of God, and the Information of Ignorant Souls (not his own Fame) have come Point blank to shew the particular Chapter and Verse (in the New Testament) where the Word Immerse (or Plunge) is express'd by the Derivative *Βαπτίζω* or the Word (or Term) Wash in baptizing, is express'd by the Primitive *Βάπτω*. He falls on a vain glorious Display, of his Rhetorical Eloquence, which he endeavours to support by the Auxiliaries fetcht out of the Armory of mistaken Antiquity, concluding that now he hath hit it.

In this he seems as confident of Victory as his Brother *Menge* is of his Mathematical Demonstration. By which he would fain prove, that the Partial Plunging, practis'd by those of his Perswasion, is the true and proper Mode to be us'd in baptizing. But both these (and all others who are their Abettors) are desired to fall like well meaning Men upon plain Scriptural Demonstrations; to make good their Cause. One plain Scripture, which is Pertinent to the Purpose, will prove more convincing and demonstrative, than all the Mathematical Demonstrations which Master *Menge*, and all the Mathematicians on Earth can devise. And then all the Arguments, which the
most

most ingenious and elaborate Antiquary can fetch from the Writings of all the Ancient and Modern Divines ; who lived on the Earth since the Holy Apostles went to Heaven.

Besides the Argument grounded on the proper Signification of the Words *Βαπτισμα* and *Βαπτίζω*, there are other Arguments laid down to overthrow Immersion in baptizing, which Men, now living, who understand the Tongues, and who have Reason to know Antiquity, as well (if not better) as the sharpest of that Perswasion, do acknowledge to be irrefutable, either by Scripture (rightly understood) or by sanctified Reason. Let those Arguments be candidly and fairly, not only answered, but also solidly confuted. And I do faithfully promise to sound a self-abasing Retreat, acknowledging (both in Pulpit and Print too) my Error and Mistake, about what I am now vindicating and defending against Anabaptism.

And if I may, without Offence to Master Immerfer, or any of the Champions for Immersion, be allow'd a Liberty, I enquire, whether they judge that the Judgment and Opinion of the Ancient and Modern Divines, whereon they lay such Stress (about Immersion) be Argumentative in Matter of Faith or not?

Here

Here they are oblig'd either to Grant, or deny.

If they deny the Judgment of the Ancient, and Modern Divines (so much boasted of) to be Argumentative in matters of Faith. Then I desire to be inform'd, wherefore they lay such Stress on their Judgment in the present controversy.

If they grant the Judgment of these to be Argumentative in the present dispute, then I desire to know : why the Adversary I am now contending with, doth not, on the same Ground they receive Immersion, receive Infant Baptism, seeing that those Ancient, and Modern Divines were for Infant Baptism. In case then, that the Patrons and Advocates for Immersion, do reject the Ancients, &c. in the case of Infant Baptism, why should they blame me if I reject them, in the case of Immersion?

I believe no man of common sense; can plead for Anabaptists: in this plain case. Had this very point been seriously (and deliberately) weigh'd, and considered by the great contenders for Immersion: I am apt to believe, they would not have been so forward in their boasting, that the Ancients, and the Modern Divines, being all on their side.

I shall not now insist on any arguments, to prove Gospel Baptism, to be by pouring

ing out Water on the subject, that being already done, I hope, to the full satisfaction of all, who have read my *Book* without prejudice.

I only request of master Immerfer (or any of his Coadjutors in this their sinking Cause) that when (if ever) He appear on the Stage again, to prove the practice of Immersion: that he will prove that *Paul* was Baptised by Immersion. *Acts* 9. 18. And likewise that the Jaylor was so baptiz'd *Acts* 16. 33. with many others, of whom the word of God makes no mention (expressly) either of their going down into, or their coming up out of the Water.

His filling up whole Pages with plausible Storys and Quotations, out of Ancient and Modern Divines, will never down with me, or any other, who make the unerring word of God the Ground of their Faith, unless He effectually, prove, those Divines to be infallible in what they say in their writings, the which when he doth, I hope the argument grounded on their infallibility (if he proves them so to be) will be altogether apertinent, to convince Anabaptists, of the lawfulness of Infant Baptism, as it will be to convince me, and others, of the lawfulness of Immersion in Baptising.

Besides the question already put, I shall presume to propose, the Fifteen Queries here following to be Resolved, the which if the Men I now dispute against, can answer fairly

fairly and solidly from God's Word, I will lie down at their Foot, and immediately become their Profelyte. If they either cannot or will not, I hope they have no Reason to think, or say, that I act against the light of my Conscience, if I continue to maintain the Divine Right of Infant-Baptism, and that the Mode of Baptizing, which the Gospel enjoins Believers to practise, is by Sprinkling (or Pouring out) the Water on the Subject.

Query 1. How prove they, that the Infant Seed of encovenanted Parents (who were, by God's Act of sovereign Grace, taken into the very same Covenant with their Stipulating Parents) were ever cast out of that Covenant ?

That they were taken into their professing Parents Covenant, I have effectually proved.

If they, who oppose Infant-Baptism, be unable to shew to which of the Prophets (under the Old Testament) or to which of the Apostles (under the New) God gave a Command to cast Infants out of their Covenant Relation to the Church of which their Parent (or Parents) is a professing Member. If they cannot demonstrate, what the Sin (or Provocation) of Infants is, whereby they have merited their being cut off from the Covenant ; then must it (necessarily)

cessarily) follow (all the Wit and Learning of Men and Angels cannot help the Adversary here) that the Infants of believing Parents are still in Covenant, and (as such) have a Covenant Right to Water Baptism.

Quer. 2. How can Anabaptists prove that *Abraham's* Blessing is come on the *Gentile-Seed* of *Abraham* under the Gospel (thro' *Christ*) seeing the Infants of Believing *Gentiles* are by them denied , to belong to the Covenant? the term, *Seed of Abraham*, extends to the Infants of *Gentile* Believers under the Gospel, as truly as it did to the Children begotten of *Abraham's* Body. This is beyond all Contradiction, as appears from *Gal. 3. 29.* compared with *Gal. 3. 14.*

Quer. 3. How prove they, that any Infants (dying in Infant State) are saved, seeing, that (according to Anabaptism) Infants neither belong to the Covenant, neither are they capable of Regeneration?

Quer. 4. How can they justify their extending the Grace of God, beyond the Bounds of God's own Covenant; in that they hold and affirm, that all Infants, without Distinction, are saved who die in Infancy?

One while they deny, that any Infants, while Infants, belong to God's Covenant, or are capable of Regeneration. Another while they hold and teach, that all Infants are saved, who die in Infant State. Now whether

whether thus to hold and teach, do not evidently prove them guilty of Self-Contradiction, and in both their Opinions, concerning Infants, whether they be not contrary to God's Word: 'tis left to all Men who can but read *English*, to judge.

Quer. 5. How can they justify their Practice, in distinguishing themselves from their godly Neighbours, by styling themselves Baptists and Baptized Churches of Jesus Christ; by which Practice, it is evident, they unchurch all the other Churches of Christ (on Earth) which are not of their Perswasion.

If I mistake not, Dr. *Russell*, that rash and confident Assertor of Immersion, and Oppugnor of Infant-Baptism; he owns, in his Book, that the Title of Baptist was first given to *John* (*viâ Eminentiæ*) by way of Eminency. Denoting the high Office, assign'd him by God, as he was to be the Fore-runner of Christ his Son, to prepare the way before him.

Where do they read, that any (in all the New Testament) were styled Baptists, even among the many who were Baptized by *John* and the Apostles of Christ? If then they can give no Instance, from God's Word, of any that were styled Baptists, among the many that were Baptized. And that it be unquestionably true; that Bap-
G 3
tist

tist denotes the Office to which *John* was called by God. Doth it not convincingly appear, how vainly they assume to themselves the Title of Baptists? and that without any Precept or Example; to warrant their Practice herein.

Baptist (if I mistake not the Term) denotes and intends Baptiser. Are all who glory in being styled Baptists, Baptisers? Conscience awaken, and speak to this Point.

Quer. 6. How justify they their Baptizing Women, seeing that Women are not intended in the Words of the grand Commission (as *Dr. Russel* asserts) they being not of the Masculine Gender; for (according to him) none are the proper Subjects of Baptism, but such as are of the Masculine Gender, or Male-kind.

By *Dr. Russels* Argument, it is plain, that as he excludes Infants from Baptism, because of their Infant State; so he excludes Women, from having a Right to that Ordinance, because they are not of the Male-kind. By which it plainly appears, that the Charity of *Dr. Russel* (and all who are one with him herein) for poor Infants and their Mothers, is of equal Extent.

Quer. 7. How prove they that such as renounce their Infant Baptism, and submit to their Practice of Dipping are (herein) acted, by an infallible Spirit?

Quer. 8.

Quer. 8. How prove they that God's Covenant of Grace (under the Gospel) hath any initiating Seal, which succeeds Circumcision, in case they grant not that Water Baptism did?

Here they must either grant or deny. If they grant that Water-Baptism did succeed in the room of Circumcision, then are they oblig'd to shew a convincing Reason, why they deny Baptism to the Infant-Seed of encovenanted Parents, seeing they were never yet cast out of Covenant.

If they deny that Water-Baptism did succeed in the room of Circumcision, then are they oblig'd to lay down convincing Reasons, wherefore they make Water-Baptism the Door of Entrance into their Churches.

Quer. 9. Whether their bearing People in hand, that Obedience to Christ in *Mat.* 28. 18. and imitating his Example (laid down in *Mat.* 3. 16.) is the Ground of their Dipping in Baptism, be not a meer empty Pretension? seeing how unconcerned they are, either to obey the Command of Christ, or to follow his Example, in the case of poor Infants, who are not able to speak, or act for themselves.

Most certain it is (it cannot be denied) that Christ commanded Infants to be brought to him, *Mat.* 19. 14. And as certain it is,

that he embraced them in his Arms, and blessed them, *Mar.* 10. 16. Why do not Anabaptists make Conscience of obeying Christ's Command, and following his Example and Practice herein?

Here's no need of flying to strained Metaphors and Consequences, where Matter of Fact so plainly appears. Let the Adversary get over this if he can.

Quer. 10. How can they prove, by God's Word, their Practice in laying such a stress on Water-Baptism (especially on the Mode of Baptizing) as tends to uphold and propagate that *Romish* Principle, which teaches that Water Baptism is (absolutely) necessary to Salvation? A Principle, no way agreeing with the Word of God, or the Judgment and Confessions of any of the Protestant Churches, either at home or abroad. And not only so, but which tends to disturb the Peace of all the Churches, and to set the Members of Christian Societies at variance among themselves. This Practice cannot be justified by the Gospel, which exhorts all the Followers of the Lamb to Peace and Order, *Ephes.* 4: 3. Plain it is to me, that those Persons who press with so great Violence and intemperate Zeal, the Necessity of Baptizing by Dipping, are as real and as great Disturbers of the Churches Peace, as they were, who, in the

Apostles

Apostles times, pressed the Necessity of Circumcision, *Acts 15. 24. Gal. 6. 12, 13.*

As the former did Idolize the Ordinance of Circumcision, I leave it to every indifferent and impartial Reader to determine, whether these do not Idolize Water-Baptism, administred by Dipping? To whom I say (as *Paul* to the Professors of his time, concerning Circumcision) *For in Jesus Christ neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but Faith which worketh by Love, Gal. 5. 6.* That Water-Baptism (whether by Sprinkling or Dipping) availeth as much to Salvation; (where the Heart remains unchanged) as Circumcision did avail those who trusted to *Moses* his Law for Justification and Life.

Quer. 11. How will they prove that Christ, who came in the Flesh to break down that Partition-Wall, which separated between *Jews* and *Gentiles*: to the end, both may become one Body, did erect (or set up) a Wall of Separation between believing Parents, and their dear and tender Babes, who (next to themselves) are the greatest Comfort a Believer desires and prays for in this World?

I believe no Man, who is taught of God, dares to think or say, that I am mistaken, when I affirm, that thus to hold, or teach, is a high and sawcy Reflection on the God of

Love, who hath planted in Parents that Principle of natural Affection to their dear Off-spring.

That God hath implanted the Principle of natural Affection in Parents, to their Infants ; and that He commands Parents to love and delight in them, as they are his promised Blessing, none can deny. Now, for Men to hold (or teach) that God hath cut off (or cast out) the Believers Seed, from sharing in the Mercy and Blessing of their believing Parents Covenant ; what is it but, interpretatively, to say, and teach, that God hath rased the Foundation of that Natural Affection, planted in Nature, by his own Spirit.

For, I would gladly be inform'd, what Delight a true Believer can take in those Children, whom God hath cast off, or rejected ?

Quer. 12. How can Anabaptists deny, without Relisting God's Truth, that the planting in of the Gentiles into Christ, must bear an exact proportion with God's casting off the Jews for their Unbelief ? When God cast out (or cut off) the Unbelieving Jews, their Children were cast out with their Unbelieving Parents. When God ingrafted (or planted) the Gentiles into their room, He took in their Infant Seed along with their believing Parents. *Rom.*

11. 19, 20. As was the Casting out of the *Jews*, such, of necessity, must be the Ingrafting (or planting) in of the *Gentiles*.

Quer. 13. How can our *English* Anabaptists reconcile their practice of Dipping in Baptism, with the practice of their Brethren in *Holland*? who baptize by sprinkling (or pouring out) the Water on the Subject: As all Orthodox Protestants are known to do.

Strange it is to me, that Dr *Russell*, and those of his Perswasion, who make such brags that the *Dutch* Translators had translated the words *John the Baptist*, *Johannes de Dooper*, *John the Dipper*: And the words *Baptizing them*, - *Salve depende*, *Dipping them*; that they should be ignorant how their Brethren in *Holland* do administer Baptism. And as strange it is, that if the Anabaptists in *Holland* had look'd on the *Dutch* Translators to be nearer the Sense of the Holy Ghost, then were other Translators of the Bible, that they should not stick to the *Dutch* Translators, in practising the Mode of Dipping in Baptising, rather than as they now practise.

The apparent difference then between the *English* and *Dutch* Anabaptists, about the mode (or manner) of Baptising, is to me an Argument, that those in *Holland* are far more considerate and wary, in snunning

and

and avoiding the ill consequences which follow pressing; and practising the mode of Dipping, rather than Sprinkling, or pouring out the Water; than are our *English* Anabaptists. They in *Holland*, I am apt to believe, know (and consider) that the term *Dip*, is never intended in the Gospel, but in a bad (or evil) sense. Whereas the term *Sprinkle* (or wash) with Water, is always taken in a good sense; the which the *English* Anabaptists either cannot, or else are resolv'd they will not mind or take notice of; least their so doing should throw down their Dagon to the Ground. To such I only say, *Qui volunt decipi, decipiantur*. They who are willing and desirous to be deceived, let them be deceived.

Quer. 14. How can Anabaptists who hold and teach, that Christ hath no true Churches on Earth, but those of their own Perswasion, justifie their Practice, in sitting down in Fellowship with those whom they own not for true Churches?

Let such answer the following Dilemma if they can.

The Congregations of their godly Neighbours, to which (but too) many of them joyn themselves, either they are true Churches of Christ, or they are not so; one of these two they must stand to. If they deny them to be true Churches of Christ, why

why do so many of them join with them in Church Communion.

If they be true Churches of Christ, how dare they to disturb and disquiet the Peace of such Churches, in pressing the Necessity of renouncing the Baptism received in Infancy, and by sprinkling, labouring all they can to draw Church-Members to be re-baptized, and that by Immersion.

Let Men pretend what they can, for such a hotch potch Communion in Churches. I stedfastly believe the Event and Issue of such Practices, will, sooner or later, convince all Gain-sayers, that it neither pleaseth Christ, nor is it any way promotive of true Peace or Gospel Holiness in the Churches of God's People. I heartily wish this may be seriously and seasonably weigh'd, and, without Prejudice, considered by those Pastors, &c. whose Duty it is to watch over the Flocks committed to their Charge, by the great Shepherd of the Sheep. And that by keeping the Churches Doors shut against such Persons being admitted into Church-Fellowship, whose very Principles have a natural Tendency, not only to subvert the Church's Peace, but, which is far worse, to destroy the very being of the Churches themselves.

Were the Churches of Christ in *England* but thoroughly awaken'd, out of that Security which

which hath (a long time) seiz'd them, they would soon become sensible of what is now complained of and witnessed against, and would be forced to acknowledge me to be a faithful Friend and a hearty Well-wisher to all the Churches of the Saints. But under their present Frames, I expect small Thanks for the present Faithfulness and Plainness here (and elsewhere) manifested for God's Glory, and the general Good of his People.

Plain it is to me, that the mixt Communion in Churches, of which many (who consider not the thing aright as they should) are too fond, is the very Source from which springs that visible Consumption in most of the Congregational Churches now in *England*.

I shall never be reconciled to that Charity which (in Pretence of Peace and Moderation) opens the Churches Door to Church destroying Principles.

There is nothing more evident to seeing and considerate Minds, than that the ground which the Congregational Churches have lost of late Years, the Anabaptists have gained it. And the Congregational Churches may thank their mixt Communions for it.

The Anabaptists seem (to outward Appearance at least) to hug and embrace the Congregational Churches, as some do the

Queen. But how near both come to the Ivy's embracing the Body of the Oak, I leave unprejudiced Men to determine.

I hope I shall die in the same Judgment of a great Divine, who said, that *in Ecclesia Evangelica recte Constituta, Anabaptismus minime est tollerandus. In a Gospel Church rightly constituted (said he) Anabaptism is by no means to be tollerated.*

How applicable to the present Purpose, that Ceremonial Prohibition recorded in *Deut. 22. 9.* is, I humbly leave to the serious Consideration of the *London Ministers.*

I would not be mistaken, as if I were out of Charity with those of the Anabaptist Perswasion, though it hath (providentially) fallen to my Lot to attack their unscriptural Tenents, on a publick Stage. A Practice, to which I have been often provok'd both in *Ireland* and *England.* Their Teachers frequently inculcating into their Followers, that those who are for Sprinkling Infants, have nothing to offer in defence of such a Practice, either from Scripture or from Antiquity. This taking with weak and injudicious People every where, I have been by Men and Women of that Perswasion, publickly set upon, to force a Dispute about Baptism. If what God hath enabled me to discover, concerning Baptism, prove uneasy and unanswerable, they are to blame themselves,

themselves, who stirr'd me up to study the Point.

Quer. 15. How can Anabaptists clear themselves from being charged with being acted by a Lying Spirit? in that they tell the World, that Infant-Baptism was not known in the World till Three Hundred Years after Christ's Time.

Whereas, it is evident to any, who look into Antiquity, that Infant-Baptism was not questioned till about Three Hundred Years after Christ. As by the particulars here following will plainly appear.

" I begin with the Account given by
 " Master *Philpot* (a faithful Martyr of Jesus
 " Christ) whose Words (concerning the
 " Antiquity of Infant - Baptism) are on
 " Record, in Vol. 3^d. of *Acts and Monu-*
 " *ments*, page 508 and page 509. He saith
 " (positively) that Infant-Baptism was not
 " oppos'd or denied, till about 3 Hundred
 " Years after Christ. His Words are these,
 " *Auxentius*, one of the *Arian* Sect was one
 " the first that denied Infant-Baptism (or
 " the Baptizing of Children.) And next
 " after him, *Pelagius* the *Heretick*. And some
 " others there were in St. *Bernard's* Time,
 " as appears by his Writings. And in our
 " Times (saith he) the Anabaptists, an
 " inordinate kind of Men, stirr'd up by the
 " Devil, to the Destruction of the Gospel.

" And

“ And afterwards, finally (saith he)
 “ I can declare out of Ancient Writers, that
 “ the Baptism of Infants hath continued
 “ from the Apostles time unto ours. Nei-
 “ ther that it was instituted by any Councils,
 “ neither of the Pope, nor of other Men,
 “ but commended from the Scripture by
 “ the Apostles themselves.

“ *Origen* (saith he, who lived Two Hun-
 “ dred Years after Christ, upon the Decla-
 “ ration of the Epistle to the *Romans*, ex-
 “ pounding the 6th Chap. ver. 8. that the
 “ Church of Christ received the Baptism of
 “ Infants from the very Apostles.

“ *Hierom* about Four Hundred Years af-
 “ ter Christ, maketh mention of the Bap-
 “ tism of Infants in his Third Book against
 “ the *Pelagians*, and in his Epistle to *Leta*.

“ *Augustine* about Four Hundred Years
 “ after Christ, reciteth, for this Purpose, a
 “ place out of *John* Bishop of *Constantinople*,
 “ in his first Book against *Julian*, Chap. 2.
 “ διατὸ τοῦ καὶ πατὴρα βαπτίζομεν. For this cause
 “ we baptize Children, &c. And he a-
 “ gain to *Hierom*, Epist. 28. 8. That *Cy-*
 “ *prian* who lived about Two Hundred
 “ and Fifty Years after Christ, not making
 “ any new Decree, but firmly observing the
 “ Faith of the Church, judged with his Fel-
 “ low Bishops, that as soon as one was born,
 “ he might lawfully be Baptized. The
 “ place

“ place of *Cyprian* is to be seen in his Epi-
 “ stle to *Fidus*.

“ *Augustine* in writing against the Do-
 “ natists, lib. 4. chap. 23, 24. saith, that the
 “ Baptism of Infants, was not derived from
 “ the Authority of Men, neither of Coun-
 “ cils, but from the Tradition or Do-
 “ ctrine of the Apostles.

“ *Cyril* (who lived in *Julians* time) upon
 “ *Lev. chap. 8.* approves the Baptism of
 “ Children, and condemns the Iteration
 “ of Baptism.

“ These Authorities of Men, saith he, I
 “ do alledge, not to tie the Baptism of
 “ Children to the Testimonies of Men.
 “ But to shew how Mens Testimonies do a-
 “ gree with God's Word, and that the Veri-
 “ ty of Antiquity is on our side, and that the
 “ Anabaptists have nothing but Lies for
 “ them, and new Imaginations, which feign
 “ the Baptism of Children to be the Popes
 “ Commandment. Thus far Master *Phil-*
 “ *pot.*

The great *Polanus* in his *Syntag. Theologicæ*,
 lib. 6. chap. 55. *de Baptismo*, lays down the
 very Words of *Origen* in his Second Tomb
 and Fourteenth Homily on *Luke*, thus,
 “ *Parvuli Baptizantur in remissionem Pecca-*
 “ *torum, quorum Peccatorum, vel quo tempore*
 “ *peccaverunt, aut quomodo potest ulla lavacri*
 “ *in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi juxta illum*
 “ *sensum*

" *sensum de quo paulo ante diximus. Nullus*
 " *Mundus a sorde, nec si unius Diei quidem*
 " *fuerit vita ejus super Terram. Et quia per*
 " *Baptismi Sacramentum Nativitatis, sordes*
 " *deponuntur propterea baptizantur & parvuli.*
 " Little ones (saith he) are Baptized for the
 " Remission of Sins. Of whose Sins, or in what
 " time have they sinned? Or how can there
 " be any need or occasion of Washing in Little-
 " ones, unless according to the Sense I have al-
 " ready mentioned.

" There is none free from Pollution or
 " Filthiness (understand of natural Birth)
 " no, though he lived but one Day on Earth.
 " And because that by the Sacrament of
 " Baptism, the Pollution or Filth of natural
 " Birth is done away, therefore it is that
 " even Little-ones are Baptized.

I will quote *Augustine* again, and the ra-
 ther, because *Dr. Russel* and others of his
 Perswasion, have, with an *Arminian* Confi-
 dence, told their Readers that *Augustine*,
 with others of the Ancients, have oppos'd
 Infant Baptism. *Augustin's* Words are
 these, " *Consuetudo Matris Ecclesiae, Bapti-*
 " *zandis parvulis, nequaquam spernenda est ;*
 " *nec ullo modo superflua deputanda, nec omnino*
 " *credenda, nisi Apostolica esset Traditio, lib.*
 " *10. de Gent. ad Lit. cap. 23.*

" The Custom, saith he, of our Mother
 " the Church, in Baptizing Little ones, is
 no

“ no way to be slighted or rejected, nor o-
 “ therwise to be esteem’d or accounted of,
 “ then as an Apostolical Tradition.

“ The same *Augustine* saith in *lib. 4. De*
 “ *Baptismo Infant. Quod universa tenet Eccle-*
 “ *sia, nec Conciliis Institutum, sed semper re-*
 “ *tentum est. Non nisi Autoritate Apostolica*
 “ *traditum verissime creditur.* That, saith he,
 “ which is held by the universal Church, and
 “ was not instituted by any Councils, but was
 “ always held, we are to believe, that it came,
 “ or was delivered, by no other then by *Aposto-*
 “ *lical Authority.*

I might fill a Volume with Authors Names, if need were, to demonstrate to the World how false these Pretenders to Antiquity against Infant Baptism are, as in other things, wherein Infant-Baptism is concerned, so also in this of Antiquity, whereby they still labour what they can to stagger simple and credulous People,

I will bring up the Rear with that most excellent and incomparable *Calvin*, whom I think fit here to mention, as being a Man of that Orthodoxy and Clearness in the Gospel, that I account it rather an Honour than a Reflection on the Ancient and Modern Divines (gone to Heaven) to have their Testimonies (in Theological Debates) back’d and confirm’d with the Judgment of so great a Man.

The judicious and penetrating *Calvin*, his Words on *Mat. 19. 13, 14.* are as here follow, "*Neque enim hoc leviter est pretereundum, quod Infantes sibi offerri Christus jubet, addita ratione, quoniam talium sit Regnum Cœlorum. Ac postea voluntatem suam opere testatur. Dum ipsos amplexus Precatione benedictioneq; suo Patri commendat. Si adduci Christo Infantes æquum est. Cur non & ad Baptismum recipi Symbolum nostræ cum Christo Communionis, ac Societatis? Si eorum est Regnum Cœlorum, cur signum negabitur?*"

This, saith he, is not lightly to be passed by, that Christ commanded Infants to be brought to him. Adding a Reason, *viz.* because of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. And afterwards he declareth his Will by his Deed. When (having embraced them) he commends them to his Father, by his Praying for them, and his blessing of them. If it it be meet that Infants should be brought to Christ, why not also that they should be received to Baptism, which is the Badge of our Communion, and Fellowship with Christ? If theirs be the Kingdom of Heaven, why should the Sign be denied them? *Calv. Inst. lib. 4. cap. 16. Art. 7.*

Again the same *Calvin* hath these Words, "*Quod autem apud Simplicem vulgum disseminant longam Annorum seriem post Christi Resurre-*"

“ Resurrectionem præterisse, quibus incognitus
 “ erat Pedobaptismus. In eo fœdissime men-
 “ tiuntur. Siquidem nullus est scriptor tam
 “ vetustus, qui non ejus Originem ad Apo-
 “ stolorum seculum pro certo referat.

“ That which they (meaning the Ana-
 baptists) “ scatter among the simple com-
 “ mon People, that a long tract of Years
 “ passed after the Resurrection of Christ;
 “ wherein Pedobaptism was unknown. In
 “ that (saith he) they most shamefully lye;
 “ for there is no Writer so ancient, who
 “ doth not refer its Original to the Age of
 “ the Apostles, as an undoubted Truth. *Calv.*
Inst. lib. 4. cap. 16. Art. 8.

Herein, I doubt not, and in his Soundness
 in the Doctrine of Justification by Faith
 alone; and his being such an invincible
 Propugnator of the Doctrine of Election,
 and Reprobation (before time) lay the
 Crimes of the Renowned *Calvin*; for which
 his truly honourable Name, and never suf-
 ficiently to be valued Writings, are so hate-
 ful to all the *Romish* Synagogue, and *Armi-
 nian* Anabaptists.

Quer. 16. Whether it be honest and fair
 for the Anabaptists, to fly to consequential
 Arguments to justify their giving the
 Lord's-Supper to Women; and their dip-
 ping the whole Body in Baptism? And at
 the same time to reject consequential Argu-
 ments

ments brought to justify Infant Baptism; and that (merely) because they are but consequential. Whether this Practice of theirs be not a manifest violation of that Golden Rule prescribed by Christ Himself, *Matt. 7. 12.* is left to every ingenious and impartial Reader to judge.

Quer. 17. Whether it argues Ingenuity and Christian Candour in Anabaptists, to catch hold of any opportunity to appear in Print, against any of the Pedobaptists, when they find they have an Advantage against an Author; and to pass by (in silence) any Author, whose Argument they know themselves unable to confute? Whether such a Practice doth not prove, that there is more of the old Serpent's Craft and Subtilty in it, than there is of that Wisdom which is from above, is left to any unprejudic'd Reader to determine. I conclude my *Appendix* with this fair Proposal, That if Master *Immerfer*, or any other of that Perswasion, can (by God's Word) confute the Arguments laid down in the foregoing Treatise, to prove the Divine Right of Infant-Baptism.

And that the Mode of Baptising must be by pouring Water on the Subject, not by dipping. If he, or any of his Party, can honestly and impartially resolve the Queries propounded in this *Appendix*, I shall forth-
with

with lay down the Cudgels, and in Pulpit and Print express my Repentance and Sorrow for appearing so zealously concerned to oppose Antipedobaptism.

If my Arguments remain still unconfuted, and the Queries here propounded be not impartially spoken to, and resolv'd; I hope those of the contrary Perswasion will no more pretend to tell the World, that the Pedobaptists have nothing to plead (either from the Sacred Scriptures, or from Antiquity) in favour of Infant Sprinkling.

If these Discoveries prove convincing, and irrefutable, I heartily and sincerely desire, that the whole Praise hereof may be ascribed to the Only Wise God, whose Blessed Spirit led me into the saving Knowledge of *Abraham's* Covenant, and blessed me with a holy Resolution to vindicate and maintain the same, in behalf of the Infant Seed of Believers, against all Opposers whatsoever. And let all who reap any Benefit by these Discoveries join with me in saying, *Amen.*

They who desire to be further satisfied of the Truth of what is most justly charg'd on Anabaptist Writers, viz. their misrepresenting Authors (by them quoted) for the Support of their antiscriptural Cause; let them, without prejudice, read the Ingenious *Obed Wills* on Infant Baptism, who hath

hath not only answer'd and confuted, but also so particularly and effectually anatomized *Henry Danvers*, for not only a Misrepresenter, but an egregious Perverter of the ancient Fathers and Councils, &c. whom he quotes in his Book against Infant Baptism, &c. that it will easily be perceiv'd (by any Man of Sense) how impossible it is for the most pregnant and sagacious of that Perswasion (now living) to help him out of that Quagmire, into which his matchless Inadvertency and unparallel'd Disingenuity hath plung'd him.

Besides which worthy Authour, (if further Provocation be given) other plain instances shall be given of the like Abuses, which some of the Anabaptist Writers (of later date) have put upon some of the most eminent of the Congregational Divines; whose Reverend Names and curtail'd Expressions have been made use of, and (egregiously) perverted, on purpose to gain the more Credit to their heterodox Opinions. And that after those godly Divines were gone to Glory. A Practice, which (besides the great wrong such Men do their own souls) carries two monstrous Evils in its Vomb.

First, It charges notorious Lies and known Falshoods on the Dead, who cannot now speak for themselves; which is both

H inhumane

inhumane and base, and no way agreeing with the known Maxim, *Nihil nisi bonum de Mortuis*; nothing should be spoken of the Deceased but good.

Secondly, It lays a Snare and a Net in the way of the Living, to beguile and draw them aside from the Paths of Duty: Which Practice is nothing short of Leading the Blind out of their way, which the Word of God expressly forbids: *Cursed be he that maketh the Blind to wander out of the way. And all the People shall say Amen*, Deut. 27. 18. compared with Matt. 15. 14. I forbear here to shew how near this Practice treads on the very Heels of the Romish Jesuits Practice. Now, whether the Anabaptists or I be to blame; they for endeavouring to uphold their Cause, by belying the Dead; or I, for endeavouring to caution and undeceive the Living, is left to the impartial Reader, who is unwilling to be imposed on, to judge.

T H E

P O S T S C R I P T.

I Had no sooner finished my *Appendix* to the foregoing Treatise (in this Second Impression) but an Account was given me, that one Master *Stennet* had appear'd in Print against Infant-Baptism, &c.

His Book I did resolve to read, if God pleas'd to permit me, to see whether any thing material hath been offer'd *de novo*, which hath not (formerly) been brought into Plea by his Predecessors, in Defence of that Cause, which he seems resolv'd to defend against all Gainstayers of what Perswasion soever.

But finding nothing in it that is either Novel, or any thing tending to enervate and confute the Arguments laid down in Defence of Infant-Baptism, &c. I saw no Occasion to make any further Enlargement on what I have now added to the foregoing Treatise; unless to make some Remarks on some Passages in Master *Stennet's* Book. To the end Master *Stennet's* Ingenuity may be acknowledged, and he, and all of his Perswasion,

swasion, be made sensible, that he is not more fixed (in his Resolution) to stand by that Cause which he hath espoused, than I am to maintain and vindicate the contrary, until Master *Stennet*, or some other of his Perswasion, fairly beats me out of the Field by the Strength of Scriptural Arguments.

The first Remark I make on Master *Stennet's* Book, is, the Ingenuity and Learning which adorns his Book, for which I can easily give him that Encomium of Praise which a Man of his Character justly deserves, from all who are Lovers of Learning. And this, without (any way) weakening the Cause I am now engag'd to defend, Master *Stennet* is not the only Man of Ingenuity and Learning who hath patronized a wrong Cause, and who hath prov'd greatly mistaken in Polemical Controversies in *Theology*. It is not Art or Humane Learning (though both be good Helps) in their proper Place; when sanctified of God, that can lead Men into a sound Understanding of the Mystery of God's Covenant with *Abraham* (the Ecclesiastical Representative and Father of all believing Church Members to the End of the World) in the behalf of himself and his Infant-Seed.

I hope neither Master *Stennet* nor any of his Perswasion, will be offended for telling him, that I cannot see of what use his florid

Tract

Tract can be, unless to let the World see what an accomplisht Patron the Antipedobaptists have gotten to advocate and solicit their Cause against the Pedobaptists.

As for the Pains he hath been at in quoting so many *Greek* and *Latin* Authors, it might have been prevented, had Master *Stennet* perus'd with Care (and void of Prejudice) those Books of the Pedobaptists, who have discovered the Unfairness (to say no worse) of his Predecessors, who have made as great a shew in quoting the same Authors, which now help to fill up and grace Master *Stennet's* Book, as Master *Stennet* now doth.

All the Quotations, wherewith his Book abounds (though he could quote ten thousand more as Ancient and Learned as them) will never move me to believe any other, but that the Infants of encovenanted Parents have as real a Right to, and are as capable of, the Ordinance of Baptism, as the most adult Professor on Earth, be his Faith never so strong.

Neither can they stagger me in the stedfast Belief, that the Word *Baptizo* signifies to wash by Perfusion, or sprinkling Water on the Subject, until I be directed to the particular place in the Gospel where the Spirit of God expresseth the Act of Dip-

ping by the Derivative *Βαπτίζω*, and the Act of Baptizing by the Primitive *Βάπτω*.

But least I may be thought to exceed the usual Bounds of a Postscript, I shall hasten to animadvert on a few Passages in Mr. Stennet's Book, wherein I think him besides the Text.

In Chap. 2. Page 25. Master Stennet tells his Reader (peremptorily) that *Tingo* and *Βαπτίζω* signify the same thing, viz. to Dip. This Assertion of his I have (I humbly conceive) overthrown in Pages 77, 78, 79, 80, 81. and with such clear Evidence of Scripture Light, as Master Stennet will never be able to gainsay with Success. To which I need to add no more, then to recommend to the serious Consideration of the judicious and unprejudic'd Reader, the places of Scripture here following, that he might be the better able to judge whether Master Stennet or I be mistaken in the Signification we give of the Word *Βαπτίζω*.

That the Word signifies Washing by Sprinkling (or Pouring out) Water on the Subject, and not Dipping, will plainly appear by *Mar. 7. 4. And when they come from the Market, except they wash, they eat not.* *ἢ αν μὴ Βαπτίζονται.* Except they be baptized they eat not. I perswade my self that Master Stennet will have a greater Regard to his Conscience, (before God) and to his Reputation among Men, than to believe or affirm,

affirm, that Dipping the whole Body under Water is there intended.

Who can (rationally) think (or believe) that the *Jews* and *Pharisees* should strip off their common Apparel, and put on other Garments, suitable to that Ceremony of Dipping, every time they went to Dinner? &c.

Such a Practice as this must needs be attended with great Inconveniency, not only on the account of the trouble of it, but especially on the account of the danger to which such a Practice would expose the Health of their Bodies. I cannot think that the Mystery of Sir *John Floyers* Cold Bathing was known to them, that they should therefrom take Encouragement to practise such frequent Dipping.

If then it be unreasonable to believe, that the Baptising practis'd by the *Jews* and *Pharisees* was not Dipping, the true Sense and Meaning of the place must be; that the *Jews* and *Pharisees* us'd alway before Dinner to wash their Hands, and that because they frequently convers'd with *Gentiles* in the Places of publick Concourse, and handled things whereby they thought themselves ceremonially defiled.

Of the same Import is *Luke* 11. 38. *And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before Dinner.*

ἡ βαπτισμὸν τοῦ δεῖπνου. That he was not baptised before Dinner.

Another place of Scripture, pertinent to the present purpose, is 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. *Moreover, Brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our Fathers were under the Cloud, and all passed through the Sea. And were all baptized unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea.* ἡ ταῦτα εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν ὡς ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ.

Here again we have the Derivative *βαπτίζω* in the Passive Voice. That which I have Recourse to these places of Scripture for, is, to lay before Master *Stennet* a fair Opportunity to shew his Ingenuity by demonstrating to the World that the *Israelites* were all dipt into the Cloud, which was over them, and to prove that they were immers'd or dipt in the Red-Sea, as they passed through it. This if he cannot do, I leave the impartial Reader to judge whether he or I be mistaken in our Apprehension of the true Signification of the Word *βαπτίζω*. Master *Stennet* he positively affirms that it signifies to Dip; and I as positively affirm, that the Word signifies to Wash, by Sprinkling or Pouring out Water on the Person, or the thing to be washed. Which of these two Litigants is safer for the honest and well-meaning Reader, who understands neither *Greek* nor *Hebrew*, to believe? As I never

I never intend to pin my Faith on the Sleeve of any Man that ever breath'd on Earth, or on any Council of Men (tho' they liv'd the Age of *Methusalem*) and were as learned as any meer Men that ever liv'd, who were not acted by an infallible Spirit; so I am far from expecting or desiring, that any Reader should be impos'd on by the Opinion of *Joseph Stenner* or *James Barry*. Let the ingenious and impartial Reader then, who would not be caught in the unseen Net of Errour (guilded over with the glittering Appearance of Gospel Truth) by hearty Prayer, beg the Eye Salve of the Spirit of Christ, to anoint the Eyes of his Understanding, that he may become capable of discerning things which are spiritual. Let him diligently compare Scripture with Scripture. Let him exercise that Reason which God hath given him. These are some of the Ways and Means by which the only Wise God brings a poor, humble, (Self-denying) Sinner to the saving Knowledge of the Truth. This Method being conscientiously observed, let the honest and well-meaning Reader seriously consider with himself, whether it be truly rational to judge and conclude, that the common Practice of the *Jews* and *Pharisees*, above mentioned, was to strip off their usual wearing Apparel, and to put on others, more fit

for the pretended Occasion of Dipping, and that every time they went to eat?

And whether it be (truly) rational to believe that the *Israelites*, but now mentioned, were lift up above the Cloud, and so immers'd or dipt into the Cloud?

And whether it be rational to think and believe, that the vast Host of *Israel* were all of them cover'd over with the Waters of the Red-Sea as they pass'd through? or whether it can be rationally suppos'd, that they had, at that time, Garments suitable to such an occasion of Dipping, which they put off when the Action or Ceremony was over? For it is not to be questioned, that if they were all (Men, Women, and Children) cover'd with the Sea, they had no Garments left which were not as wet as themselves; and consequently, no Cloths fit to put on to preserve themselves and their little ones from perishing with Cold.

These things are propos'd on purpose to lay before every impartial Reader the Irrationality and Groundlessness of Master *Stennet's* Assertion concerning the Word *Βαπτίζω*, signifying the very same with *Tingo*.

Master *Stennet* knows that the Discovery made of the Difference between the two Words *Βαπτίζω* and *Βαπτίζω*, hath so wounded their Cause, that nothing is now left to support

support and keep it from sinking, but the bare Affirmation of mistaken Men, and the Credulity of those of that Perswasion, who would fain have it so as Master *Stennet*, &c. affirms it is, and who are resolved (rather than their Cause shall suffer Ship-wrack) to believe what Master *Stennet*, &c. tells them of the Signification of the (so much controverted) Word *Baptizo*. Whether Master *Stennet* be able to make good what he affirms or no, by such solid and convincing Arguments as neither thwart the Principle of Reason (planted in our Nature) or contradict and cross the Rules prescribed by God for self Preservation, and which tends not to destroy the Analogy of Faith. If Master *Stennet* accounts himself, and those of his Perswasion, excusable for rejecting Master *Russen* his *ipse dixit*, as their Rule in Matters of Faith, when Master *Russen* gives no solid Reason from God's Word, for what he says. I hope Master *Stennet* will not blame the Pedobaptists for telling the World that they see as little Reason for their crediting Master *Stennet*, as Master *Stennet* sees for his crediting Master *Russen*, Mat. 7. 2.

I heartily wish that Master *Stennet* and I were as well agreed about the Signification of the Word now in Controversie; and Infants of believing Parents Right to Baptism,

as we are in our Resolution of believing no Man's *assertion* any farther than he produces the Word of Faith, to warrant what he offers to be believed in Matters of Religion.

I cannot so much wonder at the Mistake of good Men, who have taken *Βαπτισμ* to signify any kind of Washing, either by Dipping, Sprinkling, or pouring out Water on the Subject, as I do at Master *Stennet* for opposing and rejecting the Discovery now made, which is so plainly demonstrated by the Light of Holy Scripture, that the godly and learned Ministers (now living) into whose Hands the foregoing Treatise hath come, do wonder they never (before) took Notice of it. And indeed, had the same Discovery been made in the time of those Ancients, and Modern Divines, quoted by Master *Stennet*, I do in Charity believe, they durst not reject or sin against such clear light.

Can any Man wonder at me, for asserting that *βαπτω* the Primitive signifies to wash by Dipping only, and that *Βαπτισμ*, the Derivative signifies to Wash by Sprinkling, or Pouring out Water on the Subject, without Dipping. When I find that the Spirit of God never makes use of *βαπτω* (in all the Gospel) but in an ill Sense, witness the Scriptures quoted by Dr. *Russel* him-

himself, as above in Page 81. And when the same Spirit never makes use of the Derivative *Βαπτίζω*, but in a good sense, as every observing Reader (who understands the Greek) will find in every place in the New-Testament, where the Holy Ghost makes any mention of Baptismal Washings.

And how this came to be so strangely overlookt by so many of God's faithful Servants (now in Glory) who wanted neither Learning nor Love to the Truth, no Reason can be assign'd, but because the only wise God saw fit it should be so.

Surely Master *Stennet* dares not think (much less affirm) that the Holy God would (in his Revealed Will) alway put a difference between the Primitive and the Derivative, in case the two Words do not differ in their Sense and Signification.

If Master *Stennet* can (herein) disprove what I say, I shall be neither asham'd nor afraid to own my Errour, and forthwith embrace that Principle which now I oppose.

To be free with Master *Stennet*, I must sincerely assure him, that it cannot enter either into my Head to conceive, or into my Heart to believe, that ever the God of Love and Mercy would appoint such a Mode or Way of Administring Baptism as crosses those Rules appointed (by himself) for the Preservation of the Health and Life of mankind.

kind, and which, in some cases, is impossible to be practis'd, without hazarding both Health and Life of Administrator, and the Subjects of Baptism too.

Master *Stennet*, I perswade my self, must needs be sensible how frequent and common it hath been for Men and Women (of sickly Constitutions) by getting wet in Head or Feet, to fall into violent Fevers, whereof they have dy'd. And if such Colds gotten by a little wet, have prov'd mortal; how much more dangerous must it be for to Dip the whole Body of sickly and consumptive Bodies, into Water in Frost and Snow?

Let Sir *John Floyer* and Master *Stennet* say and believe what they please of their Cold bathing, I shall never account it any other than a tempting the Almighty, for Men and Women (in such dangerous Cases) to expose themselves to such eminent Danger, and that upon a meer Conceit and Fancy, that because it is an Ordinance, therefore, no harm can come thereby.

Let none be offended at my saying a meer Fancy and Conceit, for I know not what else to call it, there being neither express Command, nor yet any Example (*in terminis*) to warrant such a Practice. God hath promised, I grant, Protection in all our Ways, *Psal.* 91. 11. But then it must be also

also granted, that by all our ways, in that place, we are to understand, those Ways of Duty wherein our Holy God commands us to walk. We must not presume, that because God hath the sovereign Command of the Elements, and can restrain them when and how he pleases, that therefore we may, without any Fear of Harm, lye down in the frozen Water, or jump into a flaming Fire.

He who instituted the Ordinance of Baptism, hath, by his own blessed Example, taught us how we are to resist the Devil, when tempting us to any Practice which might expose us to Danger, *Mat. 4. 6, 7.* for all Christ knew (full well) that God his Father was able to prevent his falling to the Ground, and to keep him from being hurt (in case he fell to the Ground) yet he would not hearken to Satan (so as to gratifie him) in casting himself down from the Pinnacle of the Temple. And he shews the Reason, *viz.* because so to do, would be a tempting of God, which is forbidden, *Dent. 6. 16.* Notwithstanding the Promise alledged for his Encouragement, yet Christ would not stir. He knew, that Promise was pleadable by no Child of God, but he who was in the actual Performance of such Duty as God commands.

It will prove but a poor Argument to insist on the Experience of so many thousands as are daily Dipt in these Kingdoms, yea, even in Frost and Snow, who have received no harm thereby. To such I would propose that of the Wise Man, *Eccl.* 8.11. From which place it plainly appears, that God's Forbearance to visit a Person or a Multitude, with deserved Punishment, when acting that which displeaseth him, is no Argument that the Practice of such will meet with Divine Approbation. That likewise in *Eccles* 9. 1. is worthy the Consideration of those, who from their present Immunities and Exemption from Judgment, would fain perswade themselves that God loves them.

Secondly, he tells his Reader in Page 33. of his 2 *Chap.* that the Promise mentioned in *Acts* 2. 39. intends only the Promise of extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, which he looks on to be fulfilled when the Gifts of the Holy Ghost were poured forth on the Apostles.

I crave leave to tell Master *Stennet*, that this is a very poor Shift and an uncharitable Evasion, fixt on purpose to exclude the Infants of Believers from that Right which God's merciful Covenant with *Abraham* hath entail'd on them. And that which manifests it to be so, I will lay down in three Particulars.

First,

First, It is beyond Dispute, that those miraculous Gifts of the Spirit (intehded by Master *Stennet*) were not conferr'd on all the Believers, who were baptized by the Apostles, upon their Profession, but very few of them, who (savingsly) believed, had those Gifts given them.

Secondly, It is as certain, that the extraordinary Gifts spoken of were conferr'd on several Hypocrites, who, on their Profession, were Baptized

Thirdly, Were it, as Master *Stennet* would have it, that that Promise made use of by *Peter* (as a Motive to induce and encourage the *Jews* to believe in the *Messiah*) would not have had in it the force of a motive to stir them up to a receiving the Lord Jesus, by Faith. For *Peter* to have told those *Jews*, who were labouring under the Sense of Guilt, for murdering the Lord of Life (whose Blood they wished may be on them and on their Children) that if they would repent and believe they should receive the miraculous Gifts of the Holy Ghost; this would no way suit the Disease under which they laboured.

Let not Master *Stennet* be displeas'd for telling him, that herein he plainly appears to be unskilful in the Word of Righteousness, *Heb. 5. 12.* in that he proposes to wounded, dispairing Souls, such an expedient as hath in it no manner of suitableness to

to relieve them in their spiritual Distress.

Who can believe that the miraculous Gifts of the Holy Ghost, can reach the wounded Conscience of a despairing Sinner?

Surely, if they could, I know no solid Reason to conclude that *Judas* the Traitor and other Hypocrites who had the Gift of Miracles, should be sent to Hell.

Could any thing short of the pardoning Mercy of God (in the virtue and merit of that Blood of his Son which those *Jews* had wickedly shed) heal such Wounds in the guilty Conscience? Could any thing short of this give them inward Peace and Comfort? If then, nothing else but this can relieve and ease the self-condemning Conscience, all the Learning and criticizing Wit whereof Master *Stennet* is Master, can never disprove me, when I affirm that the Promise propos'd by *Peter* in *Acts* 2. 39. is, and can be no other than that Promise which God made to *Abraham*, and in him to his Seed, *Gen.* 17. 7.

This Promise of the Covenant of Grace, hath in it the strongest Motive and Encouragement that can be, to move the wounded *Jews* to lay hold on that Jesus whom they had Crucified, and whose innocent Blood they wished may be on them and on their Children.

By laying hold on this Crucified Jesus by Faith, they obtain a free and full Pardon of
that

that their murderous Act, and all their other Sins (original and actual) according to *Acts* 13: 39. And by their laying hold on God's Covenant of Grace, they lay a sure Foundation whereon to bottom their Hope and Comfort concerning their poor Children. Neither of which Benefits could come by their being made Partakers of all the common Gifts of the Holy Ghost. I cannot see how Master *Stennet* can possibly avoid owning himself in a palpable Error, about this Promise. I heartily wish that Master *Stennet* and all of his Perswasion, who are such Enemies to Infant-Baptism, were better acquainted with the spiritual Intent of God's Covenant with *Abraham* in behalf of himself and his Ecclesiastical Seed, then it appears they are.

Their great Mistakes about this Covenant is most certainly the Ground and Cause of all their Hard-heartedness against poor Infants. I am (fixedly) perswaded that the Apostles themselves were of the same Opinion concerning poor Infants before they received the Holy Ghost, as these are now. This plainly appears by their ignorantly and uncharitably rebuking those who were bringing their Little ones to Christ, for which the Lord Christ sharply rebuked them. After the Holy Ghost was given them, on Christ's Ascension, they then were given to know

know the Mystery of God's Covenant with *Abraham*, and how that the Grace exhibited in that Covenant, doth extend to the Seed of actual Believers, as well as to their Parents. After this the Apostles never carried it ruggedly to poor Babes.

Secondly, In Page 35. of his 2 Chap. He denys peremptorily that any Infants are actually in Covenant, or that they have any Right to the Seal of Baptism, in Right of their Parents Faith, until they themselves do believe and profess their Faith.

Herein I crave leave to tell him, that the Infant Seed of true Believers are more firmly interested in the Covenant of *Abraham*, by God's own Sovereign Act of Grace, than they are by their own Act, when made actual Believers. Tho' the elect Infants of a true Believer cannot lay hold on Christ by Faith as Adult Believers do, yet the Grace of God's Covenant hath made effectual Provision for that Defect in them, in that it hath comprehended them in the Covenant, as plainly appears by the express Words of the Covenant, *Gen. 17. 7.* and ranked them among Believers, terming them such, as well as the most Adult. This is plain from *Mat. 18. 6.* And terming them Holy, as *1 Cor. 7. 14.* And owning them to belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, witness *Mat. 19. 14.* and assuring us, that in Heaven,

ven, their Angels do alway behold the Face of God, *Mat. 18. 10.*

What higher or greater Character was ever, or can possibly be given to the most eminent, adult Believer, that ever breath'd, to prove their Right and Heirship to the Kingdom of Glory?

And yet, poor Infants must be denied Water-Baptism, the external Sign and Seal of God's Holy and Merciful Covenant, which confers all these inestimable Blessings and Privileges upon them, meerly because they cannot speak for themselves. For my part, I cannot see any need poor Infants have of Speech, &c. to qualifie them for Baptism, seeing they have such an infallible Advocate as the Son of God to speak for them.

I cannot but wonder how any Man's Conscience (which hath the least Spark of special Grace in it) can read, without Trembling, that Divine Caution in *Mat. 18. 10.* and at the same time, to be so inflexible and hard hearted towards poor, helpless Infants, towards whom the Lord Jesus Christ carried himself so tenderly, *Mar. 10. 16.*

Thirdly, In chap. 4. page 75. Master Sten-net tells his Reader that Infant Baptism and the Sign of the Cross (added to Baptism) bear an equal Date. For Proof whereof he quotes *Tertullian*, saying, that Unction and the

the Cross came in with Infant-Baptism, of both which *Tertullian* speaks. Whereas *Tertullian* (as quoted by Master *Stennet*) speaks not a Word of the Sign of the Cross, as appears by the Words of the Quotation.

But suppose *Tertullian* had affirm'd such a Falshood, as is unjustly father'd on him, on purpose, no doubt, to expose Infant-Baptism, and the Sign of the Cross to the same Contempt, am I bound to credit *Tertullian* in in such a Report? when it is evident, that there be Ancients more ancient and more sound and orthodox in the Truths of the Gospel than *Tertullian*, who in their Writings, give us Assurance, that Infant-Baptism bears date from the Days of the Apostles, which cannot (without notorious lying) be affirm'd of the Sign of the Cross, as the same is us'd in the Church of *Rome*.

Fourthly, In Chap. 6. Page 151. Master *Stennet* (carefully) quotes the Words of the Assembly of Divines Annotations on *Rom.* 6. 4. to confirm his Reader in the Belief, that the Assembly of Divines were for Dipping (in Baptism) and against Sprinkling or Pouring out Water on the Person, but warily conceals what the Assembly of Divines say in the Confession of their Faith, wherein they tell the World that Dipping in Baptism is not necessary, but that Baptism is rightly administred, by Pouring out
or

or Sprinkling Water on the Person, for which they quote *Heb.* 9. 10. 19, 20. *Acts* 2. 41, 42. *Acts* 16. 33. *Mar.* 7. 4.

It had, doubtless, been more for Master *Stennet's* Credit, either not to have mentioned the Assembly of Divines at all, or else to have quoted the Words of their Confession of Faith, as well as the Words of their Annotations. Master *Stennet's* Practice herein is like that of Dr. *Russell's*, in curtailing the Observations of Learned Master *Leigh* on the Word *Βάπτω*, what seem'd to make for his Cause, he takes Notice of it, and improves the same to advantage his Cause. But what he knew (full well) made against him, he (fraudulently) concealed, which Practice will neither advance God's Cause and Interest in the World, nor yet bring Credit or Comfort to the Authors of such disingenious and unfair Practices.

Fifthly, In Chap. 6. Page 123. Master *Stennet* tells his Reader, that there seems no necessity to conclude, that the 3000 converted by *Peter's* Sermon, *Acts* 2. 41. were all Baptized in one Day, whereas the Word saith expressly, that they were baptized, and added to the Society (or Church) of the Apostles the very same Day. And albeit Master *Stennet* would fain perswade his Reader, that in case those 3000 were Baptized the same Day, yet it doth not appear that

that *Peter* baptiz'd them, and that the Twelve Apostles and 70 Disciples, who were all Ministers of Christ, may very well be supposed to have immers'd them, in much less time than the space of a Day.

What Ground hath Master *Sternet* to support his Supposition, that it was as he supposes, seeing it doth not appear (by what account we have of that Work) that the 70 Disciples were (that Day) with the 12 Apostles; there is no mention in all the Chapter of them, neither doth it appear that any other besides *Peter* did baptize them.

I (for my own part) rather believe, that that great Multitude were baptized, by Perfusion, or sprinkling Water upon them, not by immersing or Dipping their whole Bodies under the Water. The ground of my Belief herein is as follows.

First, The Apostles who were (infallibly) guided by the unerring Spirit of Truth, they knew that Christ (in the grand Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19.) required not to Dip the whole Body under Water, but to wash with Water, by pouring out or sprinkling the Water on the Subject. This Mode or manner of Baptizing being, most certainly, easier for the Administrator, there being no need of an extraordinary Strength of Body to apply Water-Baptism to the Subjects thereof, by Pouring out (or sprinkling) the

Sprinkling the Water ; whereas Dipping or Plunging the whole Body cannot be done, in some Cases, without a miraculous Strength of Body. And as it is most easie for the Administrator, so it is most certainly, the most safe way for both Administrator and the Parties to be baptized, both Adult and Infants, there being in this way of Pouring out or Sprinkling the Water, no manner of Danger, to the Health and Life of Administrator, though weak and infirm in Body, nor to the most sickly and weak Constitutions; whether Adult or Infants, tho' in the sharpest Weather that can come. It is not so in Dipping ; besides both which this way of Baptizing by Pouring out or Sprinkling the Water on the Subject, doth every way more quadrate and harmonize with the Analogy which is between the outward Sign and the inward and spiritual Work of the Holy Ghost, in regenerating the Soul, in effectual calling, then Dipping the whole Body under Water doth.

This I have been enabled to make good in the foregoing Treatise, by such plain scriptural Arguments, as remain still unanswered, and which Master *Stennet* will never be able to overthrow, by all the Help the Lexiographers and Latin and Greek Ancients in *Græc. Colledge*, (on which he depends) can afford this Cause. To which

I will add, and by all the Arguments which his Wit and Learning can pick out of those pretty Romantick Stories which his so much admired Sir *John Floyer* tells him, of the Benefits which come by Cold bathing. They must needs have their Faith built on a firm Foundation, who, for Arguments, run to such trifling and nugatory Topicks as Sir *John Floyer's* Cold Bath, and Master *Menge*, his Mathematical Demonstration, with their wrested, and misunderstood Metaphors. Sir *John Floyers* Account he gives of Cold Bathing, in Favour of Immersion or Dipping in Baptism, will rather countenance and make for the juggling Conjurors of the *Romish* Synagogue, who make the Holy Sacrament of Baptism no better than a Spell or a Charm, than to induce any thinking serious Mind to embrace Dipping in Baptism to be the Mode prescribed by the Wisdom of Christ, because as Sir *John* seems to suggest (and Master *Stennet* believes) that Dipping the whole Body under Water, whether robust and healthy, or sickly or infirm Bodies, and whether it be in hot or in the coldest Weather which comes, so it be done in the way of an Ordinance, it is rather a Restorative to, and a Preservative of, the Health of the Body, than otherwise. A pretty Device to make credulous Folk in love with Dipping. Believe this who can.

For

For my part I cannot. And my Reason is this, *viz.* because Christ hath instituted and appointed that Holy Ordinance (of Water Baptism) to be a visible Sign, to signify and seal the spiritual Blessings of the Covenant of Grace to the true Believer, and to his Church-Seed ; not to effect miraculous Cures on Humane Bodies.

I grant, that there is no limiting the Lord's Almighty Power, who can work a Cure where, when, and how he pleases. But we must consider and believe, that *à posse ad esse, non valet Argumentum.* We must not argue from the Power to the Will of God.

If Master Stennet and those of his Perswasion, do think that the Relation given by the Authors he quotes concerning the Cures, effected (by Dipping the whole Body in the Water) will afford a convincing Argument to prove Immersion, the only way of Administring that Ordinance. I hope he will allow me to ballance this with what Persons (yet living) know to be true concerning young Infants, who have been so far gone in Fits, that all who have seen them have despair'd of their Life, who, when Baptiz'd, by Pouring out the Water on them, have immediately reviv'd and recover'd to Admiration. If any be so uncharitable as to question the Truth of what I here offer to Consideration, the Matter

of Fact will be effectually proved. Besides which, there have been too many Instances of Persons who have felt the Inconveniency of being Dipt in Frost and Snow; some of whom I my self have known.

I have read, in the Writings of good Men, of some who have been in such apparent Danger by the Practice of Dipping, that both the Administrator (himself) and the Person to be Dipt, had, unavoidably, been drown'd, had not a By-stander leapt into the Water and recover'd both; which, in my Judgment, affords an Argument rather against than for Dipping.

Sure I am, my Reason tells me, that the God of Mercy, who prefers Mercy before Sacrifice, *Matt. 9. 13.* would never approve of such a Rigidity in any of his Servants, who lay such stress on a Ceremony, as to expose the Life of a Man for it.

Whenever Master *Stennet* pleases to encounter the Argument, grounded on the apparent difference between βαπτω the Primitive, and βαπτίζω its Derivative. He will find more in it, then, I am apt to believe, he will be willing to own, to his Admirers. He will not find in it such a little criticism as he fancies he found in οὐδατα πομὰ. He may search all his Antiquity and Lexiographers, of whom he seems so confident, before he can find out an Hebraism to help his Cause here.

A *second* Reason, why I cannot believe that the 3000 abovementioned were baptized by Immersion, is, because it is not rational to judge, that so vast a Multitude, who came under such a sudden and unexpected Change, should come prepared and furnished with Garments, suited to such an Occasion, as Dipping the whole Body under Water.

Neither doth it consist with that Modesty and Decency required in the Gospel, that they should be baptized Naked; such a Posture not becoming so publick and solemn an Ordinance; in which the Eyes of God, Angels and Men, were fixed on them.

And it is as contrary to sound Reason, to believe they were dipped in the Apparel they then wore, that being directly repugnant to the Law of Self-Preservation.

I cannot see how Master *Stennet* can avoid here, but by flying to the *Romish Assylum* of pretended Miracles. The which if he doth, he will thereby fall under the same Censure with that Synagogue of *Rome*, who are forced to support their lying Doctrines with pretended Miracles, 2 *Theff.* 2.

11, 12.

And whereas it hath been conceived, that had the Practice of Dipping been continued, many new vain Niceties and Dis-

putes about Baptism had been prevented. I dare presume, that should all the Pedobaptists in *England* agree to baptize by Immersion, on Condition the Anabaptists would yield to baptize the Infants of believing Parents, they would never yield that Point.

By this it would appear, as now it doth, who are the vain Disputers, the Pedobaptists, for maintaining and vindicating the Rights and Privileges entail'd on the Seed of Believers by God himself; or the Antipedobaptists, in depriving them thereof. Any, not depriv'd of common Sense, must needs own it to be more commendable and allowable, to contend for that which is a substantial (or an essential) Branch of God's Covenant of Grace, then for that which is (at best) but a Ceremony. The first of these, *viz.* that Branch (or substantial part) of God's Covenant, wherein the Infants of Believers are concern'd, is of far greater consequence, than to be so easily parted with by those, who understand how great a Mercy and Privilege is, by that Branch of the Covenant, conferred on Believers, and their poor Infants.

For Illustration sake, I will suppose, that a Great Man (by his last Will and Testament) settles his Estate on Master *Stemmet*,
and

and his Children ; my Reason tells me, that Master *Stennet* would not like well, that any Man (or Party of Men) should go about to nullifie that part of the Will, wherein his Infants are concern'd. And in case that designing Party should alleadge, for their so doing, that Master *Stennet's* Infants are non intelligent Subjects, who understand not what a Will means, neither are capable (at present) of managing such an Estate, would not Master *Stennet* account such a Design unjust and wicked ? No man of Sense but would conclude, that Master *Stennet* would oppose such ill designing men ; And would account it his Duty to speak and act for his poor Infants, who can neither speak nor act for themselves.

Whether the present metaphor be apt and proper to the business in hand, I leave to Master *Stennet's* Conscience to determine.

Some have objected thus, Master *Stennet*, against whom you print, he is both an ingenious and a good Man, and many of his Perswasions are very good People, and therefore ought not to be fallen upon in such a Day as this.

To such Objectors as these I answer, That neither Ingenuity, nor Goodness in a Person or a Party, ought to gag or muzzle up the Mouths, or Pens of Ministers from

detecting and decrying Errours in Holy Religion.

Yea, I will be bold to affirm (let who will censure or condemn me for the same) that the more ingenious and good a Person or Party seems to be, the more dangerous are their Errours; and by far the likelier they are to spread and infect, (where they come) unwary People, who are not capable of distinguishing Truth from Errour.

Satan is never more likely to ensnare, than when he transforms himself into an Angel of Light, 2 Cor. 11. 14, 15.

It is an old Maxim, and as true now as ever, *That in Nomine Domini, incipit omne Malum.* In the Name of the Lord, all Mischief begins. The Romish Jesuits (in Masquerade) hope, in this Day, to root out of these Kingdoms the Protestant Religion, and the true Upholders and Maintainers of the same, and that under a plausible and specious Pretence of securing and upholding the Church.

That Master *Stennet* is an ingenious and a good Man; and that many of that Perswasion are gracious good People, I have already granted, But what then?

Must their spreading Errours (which are grown so epidemical) be, in Complement, conniv'd at and let alone?

Sure I am, that either the Pedobaptists or the Anabaptists, must be in an Errour, in those Principles wherein they oppose each other. Both cannot be right in the same Principle about which they differ. This is a Truth too plain and obvious to be deny'd. If the Anabaptists be in the right, why do not the Objectors openly espouse their Cause, and conform to their Principles?

If the Anabaptists be wrong and corrupt in their Principles, why should the Objectors blame any Man, for detecting and decrying their Errours? and that in hopes of convincing them and recovering them from those Errours, and likewise for preventing the Churches of God in the Nations being over-run with Anabaptism.

Secondly, Far be it from me to speak or write against any thing that is good and commendable in any Man of what Party soever.

Thirdly, I absolutely deny, that what I oppose in Master Stennet, is any part of his Goodness, namely, his denying the Divine Right of Believers Infant-Seed to Water Baptism, and that baptizing by Sprinkling or Pouring out Water on the Subject, is not right Baptism.

Fourthly, I hope the Objectors will allow me to tell them, that there are many good Men of other Perswasions, whose erronious

Principles the Objectors will own is their Duty to oppose and witness against, notwithstanding they be otherwise good Men in the main. Why should Master *Stenner*, be spared more than they?

Suppose *Aaron* (the Saint of the Lord) were now in *London*, and should make a Golden Calf for the People of *London* to Worship God by, as he did in the Wilderness, *Exod.* 34. 4, 5. Would the Objectors think or say, that the People of *London* ought to Worship God by his Image, because *Aaron* was a holy, good Man?

Fifthly, I have already inform'd my Reader how the good Spirit of God hath taught and enabled me to distinguish between Persons and their Errours, whether the same be in Principle or in Practice. The Persons of erroneous Men I love, and shall, I hope, be ready to pay that Deference and Respect to their Persons which the Character they bear, calls for at my Hands. But their Errours I am commanded to hate and reprove. I no where find that the Holy God, who commands my Love and Charity to be extended to the Name and Person of my Brother (or Neighbour,) doth allow me (in pretence of Charity) to favour or connive at his Errours and Mistakes in Holy Religion; but the contrary, as appears *Deut.* 17. 12. *Ephes.* 5. 11. Yea, God him-
self

self assures me, that to recover a Person from the Errour of his Way, is the highest Act of Charity to an erring Brother, which one Christian is capable of expressing towards another Christian in this Life, *Jam.* 5. 19, 20. And how this can be expected when a Person's or a Party's Errour is wink'd at, and not discovered and confuted, I am not able to understand.

It will again be objected. But those Points wherein we and they differ, are not Fundamental.

Ans. In three particulars.

First, By the matchless Industry of that Party, who spare neither Pains nor Charge to propagate their Principles, in order to proselyte the Members of other Congregations both in City and Country (to their way) it should seem they look on the Difference between us and them to be Fundamental : witness the elaborate Industry of Master *Stennet*, and others of that Persuasion, in raking into, and sifting the very Ashes of mistaken Antiquity, to pick up what may help their bleeding Cause. As also the great Charge which that Party are at in their large Subscriptions to Master *Stennets* so much commended Book, there being (as I am credibly informed) no less than 6500 of them subscribed, which at 2 s. the Book, amounts to 650 l. These Books

are now a dispersing up and down in City and Country. And albeit there be as little in the Book to the purpose, for which it is intended, as any I have seen on that Subject ; yet it being varnisht and sent out with the enticing Allurements of strange Tongues, &c. and bearing the Name of its Author in its Frontispiece, it will, I doubt not, be most taking with those who least understand it.

— *Secondly*, What though the Anabaptists do own no other Foundation (whereon to build their Hope for Salvation) but Jesus Christ the Son of God. Yet, to me it seems plain, that in denying God's Holy Covenant with *Abraham* (the Ecclesiastical Representative of all believing Church-Members, and their Infant-Seed to the end of the World) to be the Covenant of Grace, and their shutting out the Infants of Believers from sharing in the Blessings of that Covenant ; and their holding and teaching, that the Sinners own personal Acts of Faith, and Repentance is that which intitles a Sinner (or which gives him a Right) to the Covenant of Grace ; they cannot be excus'd from being fundamentally erroneous, to hold and teach, that Personal Qualifications give Right to God's free Covenant of Grace, is as truly an Error against the Foundation, as it is to make
the

the Virgin *Mary*, or an Angel, the Object of our Hope.

The Saying of *Augustine*, the foundest of the Ancients, is most Orthodox, and to be acknowledged by all sound and experienced Protestants. *Gratia nullo modo gratia, nisi est omni modo Gratuita.* Grace, saith he, is no way Grace, unless it be every way most free, *Aug. de lib. Arbit.*

Thirdly, What though it were granted, that the Anabaptists are not fundamentally erroneous; yet considering the spreading and infectious Nature of Errour, and how receptive Man's corrupt Nature is of the same, especially considering the Mischief already done in the Churches of Christ, by the exorbitant Growth of Anabaptism, these several Years past, it may well seem strange to any thinking and judicious Christian, that any should be blam'd for endeavouring to stem the Tide of such a spreading and prevailing Errour, which equally threatens the unchurching all the Churches in the Kingdoms which are not of their Perswasion.

A little Leaven leaveneth the whole Lump, 1 Cor. 5. 6. A little Fire in a wrong place of the House (if not prevented in time) will soon devour a whole Town, Jam. 3. 5. A small Quantity of Poison will kill the strongest Man living. And
it

it is never more likely so to do, than when it is convey'd in a Man's Drink or Physick.

The Application of these Metaphors, I leave to the Care and Ingenuity of those who are unwilling to be insensibly caught in the Nets of those *who lie in wait to deceive*, Ephes. 4. 14.

To such I would only say, that the nearer an Errour (in Holy Religion) comes (in shew and outward Appearance) to Gospel Truth, the more taking it is with well meaning People, who are not acquainted with the Depths of Satan, *Rev. 2. 24.* Let such Persons frequently read, with earnest Prayer to God's Throne of Grace, that of *Paul*, Rom. 16. 17, 18.

Fourthly, I know of no Inconveniency that can attend a serious cautioning Churches, Families, and particular Persons, to have a special Care they be not caught in the Nets of gilded and painted Errours.

Let the times prove never so dangerous to the Protestant Interest, the Objectors will find I stand on a Foundation which will never fail them that build thereon. I am far from designing to alienate the Affections of Protestant Brethren and Neighbours one from another, in such a gloomy Day, as to me seems to be near. For all who know me, will witness for me, that my Judgment is, that for all Protestants, who resolve not to be

be Papists, it is their undoubted Duty, and will prove the Interest and Safety both of Non and Conformists, to unite as one Man, against the common Enemy, who seeks equally the Ruine of all.

But tho' I grant it to be the Duty of all, both Non and Con, to unite in Affection and common Interest, I cannot see how uniting in erroneous Principles can be justified.

The Improvement which Anabaptist Writers have made of the unwary Concessions of good Men, who, for want of clearer Light, have granted, that the Word *Βαπτίζω* doth, promiscuously, signifie either to Dip into, or to Wash by Sprinkling or Pouring out Water on the Subject, ought to make us the more considerate and wary how we comply with so vigilant an Adversary, who watches all Occasions to lay hold of the least seeming Advantage, to help their sinking Cause. As in this very Case about the Sense and Meaning of the Word *Βαπτίζω*, most plainly appears.

The impartial Reader may observe how fast a Hold Master *Stennet* takes of the Concession of good Men about this Word; the which he backs with a new coin'd Device, viz. pretended Miracles, than which he could not have propos'd a more Staggering and ensnaring Temptation, to put his unwary

wary and injudicious Reader out of Conceit and Love with the Baptism received in Infancy and by Sprinkling, and to fall in love with Immersion or Dipping. The latter of these being attended, as he informs us, with a miraculous Cure of bodily Diseases, and that as soon as the Party immers'd is lifted up from under the Water. What can be more taking with poor credulous Persons, who labour under malignant and prevailing Distempers of Body, than this?

Such Persons who have but an implicit Faith to credit this chymical Whim, need not the Advice of the Physician, or the help of Physick, (the ordinary Means appointed by God for helping Humane Bodies, when sick or ailing) 'tis but renouncing their Infant-Baptism, and submitting to the Cold Bath of Believers Baptism, by being Dipped under the Water, and the Work is done.

I cannot but wonder, that a Man of Master Stennets Reading, should not remember, and consider, that to pretend to, and boast of Miracles, for the proof of a Party's Religion being the true Religion, is, by all Orthodox Protestant Divines and Churches, accounted one of the infallible Characters of a false Church.

That the Doctrine deliver'd by the Son of God, and transmitted to us by the Ministry of his holy Prophets, and blessed Apostles,

Apostles, was confirm'd (over and over) by Miracles from God, is granted.

And that God is still, and ever will be, the same, as able to effect (or produce) Miracles, on any Occasion, as ever, must be acknowledged. But it must also be remembred, and acknowledged, that *a posse, ad esse, non valet Argumentum*. We must not argue from the Power, to the Will of God.

The Cannon of the Holy Scripture being now perfect and compleat, we are not to expect or look for new Miracles.

The Premisles consider'd, I hope, when the Impartial Reader hath duly examin'd and weigh'd, in the even Ballance of God's Word, what is here offer'd to Consideration ; he will not be offended at my telling Master *Stennet*, that nothing could possibly be offer'd in favour of Immersion, which more exposes it to the dislike of every impartial and ingenuous Reader, than this of pretended Miracles.

For it is but rational to conclude, that if Master *Stennet* knew himself able to produce but one single Text (either Precept or Example, in plain Terms) to justify and make good the Doctrine of Immersion, he would never have expos'd himself at such a rate, by his treading so near the Footsteps of the Apostolical Synagogue at

Rome,

Rome, in flying to the *Asylum* of their pretended Miracles: As also his filling so many Pages with frivolous and needless Quotations to support and Credit his Cause. God's Truth stands in no need of pretended, lying Miracles, or of humane Testimonies, to recommend it to the Conscience of true Believers. God's Truth carries with it its own Evidence, to satisfy the renewed Conscience that is is God's Truth.

I conclude with assuring Master *Stenner*, and those of his Persuasion, that I am still (and hope to die) in perfect Charity with him and them, notwithstanding the Plainness and Sharpness here used to prevent the Spreading and Growth of Anabaptism.

And if Master *Stenner* (or any of his Persuasion) can enervate and confute (by Arguments plainly Scriptural) the Arguments laid down in the foregoing Treatise, to prove the Divine Right of Infant Baptism; and likewise to prove, that the right mode of administering Water Baptism, must be by Sprinkling (or Pouring) the Water on the Subject; the next Appearance I make in Print, shall be to acknowledge my Mistakes (about Baptism, &c.) to the World; and heartily to beg Pardon of Master *Stenner*, and the rest of that Persuasion, for misrepresenting their Principles, (as I have done) in case my Arguments be proved unscriptural. If

If this Book remains still unconfuted, I heartily beg, that every Church, Family, or particular Person, who have reapt Benefit by it, will give God hearty Praise for such plain Discovery on this controverted Subject.

In case Master *Stennet* renew the Occasion of further Dispute, he may (perhaps) find more Remarks made on what is contain'd in his Book, which he will never be able to make good by God's Word soundly explain'd and rightly apply'd.

F I N I S.







